المنظومة البيقونية

Commentary of The Poem Al-Bayqūniyyâh
by Shaykh Haytham Sayfaddîn

رضوان الدقاق

Transcribed By Radwan Dakkak

Science of Hadith

<p dir="rtl" align="center">بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم</p>

Lesson 1:

<p dir="rtl" align="center">إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:</p>

Inshā'Allâh today will be the first lesson about the sciences of Hadīth, and what we're going to start with is the terminology of Hadīth, because if we look at the sciences of Hadīth, there's many different topics within this general topic, there's many sub-topics, or many sub-sciences in this.

So one of them is the terminology itself, one of them is the rules of Hadīth, with regards to what are certain rules that need to be followed when judging upon a Hadīth if they're authentic or not. Another one is the sciences related to the men of the chains of Hadīth and whether they are considered acceptable or not, and so on. So obviously the first thing that needs to be understood is the terminology that's actually used because you can't go on further if you don't understand the words and the terms that are being used by these scholars, so this is what we'll be starting off with today Inshā'Allâh.

And the idea or the concept of knowing what is authentic and what is weak is the basis of the Sharī'ah, because obviously if we know and we'll discuss it in more detail soon, but we know that if we say that a Hadīth is authentic or meaning that we accept it whether it's authentic or Hassan which we'll get to soon. But if we say that Hadīth is acceptable and attributing to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then we're attributing it in the end to Allâh (سبحانه وتعالى) because we know that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent to teach the people their religion and we know that his statements are statements from the Wahī, unless we have evidences to show otherwise. Likewise are his

actions and his approvals, so anything that we have from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is considered part of the Sharī'ah with some small exceptions to this which we would need specific evidence to say or to prove this, so we know that it's important to be able to discern what is authentic from what is weak and what is rejected from what is acceptable.

And al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله) who was one of the earlier scholars, well not necessarily earlier but earlier than our time, he was one of the main scholars of Hadīth that went through and wrote books on the rules of Hadīth, he narrates a story from a scholar and a poet, and it's a story that illustrates the importance of knowing what is authentic and what isn't, so he narrates a story from 'Uthmān al-Warrāq(رحمه الله) who was a scholar that he was walking about outside, and he met a poet and this poet was walking around, he was walking in the street and eating at the same time, and back then and up until very recently, it was considered something that was shameful to eat outside infront of people, so that's just kind of the point of this or some background information of this story, so he saw him eating outside and he said to him, aren't you ashamed to do so outside, so this person said and why would I be ashamed, and he said because there are people walking around you and everyone's watching you while you're eating, so he said if you were in a building and there was a bunch of cows around you, would you be ashamed to eat infront of these cows, so the scholar said isn't this a very insulting thing to say about the people, and he said, watch just be patient and I'll show you how these people are just like cows.

So he stood up and this poet was known for telling stories, he was, they call it **"Qassās"** he was a very eloquent speaker, and people would stand around to listen to his stories, so he started speaking and telling stories and in the end he mentioned and he said a Hadīth in which the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

"Whoever is able to touch the tip of his nose with his tongue will enter Jannâh"

So then everyone in this group, pretty much began starting to touch their nose with their tongue and they're sticking out their tongue and trying to lift it up and everything, trying to do this. And then they went away, everyone is doing this as they're walking away, so then he said didn't I tell you that these people

are just like cows, so you know if you watch a cow when they lick their nose, their tongue is really long, but the point of this is if you don't know how to accept things from the Sharī'ah and when to reject things and what are the rules and how to look at things, anyone can come up and tell you anything about the Sharī'ah and you're going to be lost. You're either going to accept everything or you're going to reject everything or someone will tell you one thing, you'll follow it and someone will come and tell you something opposite and you'll follow that & you'll never know what to do, and you'll essentially be like a slave to whoever you're listening too at the time, so this is why it's important to have some understanding of the sciences of Hadīth, even if it's just basic just to know what to do in situations like this and how to approach Ahādīth in general. And even from the earlier scholars, they were always very respectful of the scholars of Hadīth and knew their status and they knew what they provided for the religion and how important their work was.

And Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله) as well, he narrated from Yazīd(رحمه الله) that he said:

"Every religion has its knights, and the knights of this religion are the people of the Isnād"

Or that every religion has people that protect it and the people who protect this religion are the people of the Isnād or the people of the chains of narration, because they're the ones who would know what could be accepted and what needed to be rejected and why, and they could prove this, so they were the ones in reality in this sense who protected the religion from having things introduced into it and having things rejected from it that might be authentic, so this is the way that we would understand this statement.

And also al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله) narrated from Imām Sufyān al-Thawrī(رحمه الله) who is from the major scholars of Hadīth, from the early scholars of Hadīth that he said:

"The angels are the guards of the heavens and the people of Hadīth are the guards of the Earth"

So we see that they understood the work that the people of Hadīth did, and this is one of the reasons why it's important to study the issue of Hadīth, and also 'Abdullâh ibn Mubārak(رحمه الله) said:

"The Isnād is from the religion in my opinion, because if it wasn't for the Isnād, then anyone who wanted, could've said anything that they wanted"

Because anyone could come and say the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this or 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) did this and Abū Bakr(رضي الله عنه) said this and so on and so on, and without having this chain of narration, there's no way to know what was authentic as opposed to what was rejected. So he considered this, and this is narrated by a number of other scholars, and that they had the understanding that the chain of narration and the mentioning and narrating this chain of narration is actually part of the religion, because it's something that actually protects the religion and it's essentially the means that we reach our religion with.

And there's many examples of scholars in the past when they would take Ahādīth from their shaykhs that sometimes they would say, tell us the Hadīth without the Isnād, all we want is the matn or all we want is the thing that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said or did, and they would respond and it's narrated from a number of scholars that they would say:

"This one wants to get up onto the roof without having a ladder" or **"How do expect to get on top of a house without a ladder"**

So the point is, we don't just get somewhere without a means to it, so knowing what's from the religion can't happen without having the means to do so and the means that we use in knowing what is from the religion is by having this Isnād or having this chain of narration. And another quote from Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) that he said:

"Indeed this knowledge is part of the religion, so look to those who you take your religion from"

Or investigate or be aware of those who you take your religion from, so the point of that is that the knowledge that we seek is part of our religion, it isn't just something that we're seeking for without benefit or with no law behind it, it's actually part of our religion, so just as we wouldn't or we shouldn't trust

our religion to anybody, the same thing that goes for the knowledge itself about the religion, because if we want to follow our religion, obviously we need to have knowledge about it, so just saying I'm going to take whatever from whoever doesn't work that way and you're going to end up losing your religion that way. And then he continued and he said:

"I met over 70 people in this Masjid[of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم)], each one of them saying I heard so and so say that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said"

So meaning that he met over 70 people in this Masjid that they would say that they heard someone from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so they would narrate chains of narration to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) for the Ahādīth and he said:

"Each one of them, if they were put in charge of the wealth of the Muslimīn, they would've been trustworthy of it, but I didn't take anything from them because they weren't from the people of this matter"

So meaning they were trustworthy, they weren't liars, they weren't cheaters, they weren't anything like this, but despite this, I did not take from them the Ahādīth that they would narrate because it's not sufficient just to be someone who doesn't lie, you need to have a higher status and be at a certain level of a person in their religion in order to narrate Ahādīth and in order to be considered acceptable to take Ahādīth from, so we know Imām Mālik(رحمه الله), his status in islam, he rejected all of these Ahādīth from these people, even though he said if these people were in charge of the Bayt al-Māl, so all the wealth of the Muslimīn, they would've been trustworthy, so it had nothing to do with them being untrustworthy, but he just didn't see them fit for narrating the Ahādīth of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

So this is just a very small introduction as to the importance of having knowledge of the sciences of Hadīth, and due to this, many scholars have written many books, some of them are large, some are small, some are only poems as we have infront of us, so they would write them in different ways. There's much effort being put into just talking about the sciences of Hadīth or even just the terminology of Hadīth, so there's this poem here that we have, but there's also many other books that were written on this, Muqaddîmat ibn al-Salāh is one that is very well known, or it's a book by ibn al-Salāh(رحمه الله) in

which he talked about the terminology of Hadīth, and al-Mūqidha by Imām al-Dhahabī(رحمه الله), and Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Hadīth by Imām al-Hākim(رحمه الله) and so on. So there's always been an effort been put by the scholars to teach the sciences of Hadīth and in specific, the terminology of Hadīth because like I said earlier, this is the first step that the person needs to have when they're studying Hadīth, is they need to know what is the actual terminology that I'll be reading later on, so if I go onto another level, what are these scholars going to be using as their terminology, because I need to know that before I'm going to understand anything that they're saying, so i chose this poem for a number of reasons:

First of all, because it's in English, so it would save time in translating it and each one of you could take it home or have it at home in order to read or make notes beside it or whatever they wanted to do with it.

Secondly because it's very basic, it's the most basic, or one of the most basic texts on the terminology of Hadīth, as you see it's only 34 verses of poetry and it fits on 1 page so it's very basic, it doesn't go into too much detail, but despite that because it's in poetry form it does need some explanation with it, because if someone just read this poetry, it probably wouldn't make much sense or they wouldn't get too much benefit out of it, so that's why it's important to have some sort of explanation with it.

As to the author of this poem, not much is known about him, what is known is that his name was 'Omar ibn Muhammâd ibn Fattūh al-Bayqūnī al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi'ī(رحمه الله), so he was from Damascus and his Madhab was the Shāfi'ī Madhab. There's some dispute about his first name, some say 'Omar and some say Tāhä, but most say that it's 'Omar, essentially this is all that we know about him, and we know that he lived before the year 1080AH, and that's all we know. There's a dispute about al-Bayqūn, so he's attributed as al-Bayqūnī, so what does this mean? Some say that it's an attribution to a province in Azerbaijān that was near Kurdistān that was called al-Bayqūn, but others said it's unknown as to whether it was a family name or if it was a city or something like this, so this all that we know about the author.

So in their explanations of this poem, many of the scholars that explained it mentioned that this is something that shows how many scholars used to be,

not every scholar was well known, not every scholar had a large biography, not every scholar would talk about himself and tell everybody everything that they ever did and where they went and who they studied with and things like this. Now we see the opposite, people who are just speakers will have pages and pages of biographies and they'll have where they studied and what kind of sports they like and what they like to eat and so on and so on, and you'll know everything about them despite the fact that you don't need to know anything about them, because they are not really people of knowledge, so this is something that many scholars mention about this scholar himself that really, the benefit that has come from this poem that he wrote is very immense, as I'll talk about soon, this poem has been explained and commented on ever since it has been written by many many scholars, but despite that we don't really know much about the author.

So the first with regards to the commentary on this, so we said is that this scholar lived before the year 1080AH, the first known explanation or commentary on this poem is in the year 1098AH, it was written by Muhammâd ibn al-Hassan al-Hassani al-Hanafī(رحمه الله) and he called it "**Talqīh al-Fikar bi-Sharh Mandhūmat al-Athar**" and after that, there's one from Muhammad ibn 'Abdûl Bāqī al-Zarqānī(رحمه الله), and that's the most well known commentaries on this, and in the end, ever since it has been written, there's been over 20 explanations & commentaries on this poem, some of them have been published, some aren't published, they're still in manuscript form, some of them have been done on tapes or recorded by voice and even today it's still one of the most explained or commented on poems with regards to sciences of Hadīth which all of the major scholars, or most of the major scholars of Hadīth today have commented on, Sulaymān ibn Nāsir al-'Alwān(حفظه الله), and 'Abdûl Karīm al-Khudayr(حفظه الله), and 'Abdullâh al-Sa'd(حفظه الله), and 'Abdûl 'Azīz al-Tarīfī(حفظه الله), and many others, Sa'd al-Humayd(حفظه الله) and so on and so on, all these scholars have commentaries on this poem, some of them are written & some of them are recorded in voice, and some of them are through video, but the point is that if you see that ever since this poem was written, it has been constantly commented on and explained, it shows the weight of it and it shows the benefit of this poem and it gives you an idea of the importance of why it should be studied and Inshā'Allâh that's why we will begin with that, so Inshā'Allâh we'll start here then.

The first thing that the author mentions is:

<div dir="rtl" align="center">

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

</div>

And we talked about **Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm** before in the 'Aqīdah lessons, but just to go over it quickly again. The beginning with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm is based upon the Qur'ān and the Sunnâh, we know that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) began the Qur'ān with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm and every Sūrah except for Sūrat al-Tawbah begins with this verse, or this Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, and we know that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) mentioned about the letter that the Prophet of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), Sulaymān(عليه السلام) sent to who they call Bilqīs or the queen of Saba', that he began it with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, so we see that it's mentioned over and over again in the Qur'ān as something that letters or written matters are began with.

And also we know in the Hadīth of Anas ibn Mālik(رضي الله عنه) in which the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was forming the **Sulh** or the pact or the peace pact I guess you could call it, in this Hadīth that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was writing the conditions of this peace treaty or this Sulh with Quraysh, and he told 'Alī(رضي الله عنه) to write Bismillâh al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, so before 'Alī (رضي الله عنه) was able to write it, the delegate from Quraysh Suhayl ibn 'Amr, he said:

"Let it be just Bismillâh because we don't know what Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm is"

So the point of it here is that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) would begin his letters with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm and also we see this in the letter which he sent to Herackle who was the king of Rome or the king of the Romans at the time, in Sahīh Muslim that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) sent this. So we see this, that it's something that was well known that letters were began with, there's many Ahādīth in which generally have the meaning:

"Every matter of importance that isn't begun with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, then it is void of any Barakah(blessings)"

All of these Ahādīth are weak, some of them mention **"Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm"**, some of them mention **"Alhamdulilâh"** and so on, and some of

them just mention the remembrance of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), but all of these Ahādīth are considered weak, specifically the one that mentions Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, it was narrated by al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله) on the authority of Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), but it contains a narrator whose name is **Ibn al-Janadī**, who is considered a weak narrator, plus the Ahādīth are contradictory, so some of them mention like I said **"Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm"** and some mention other matters.

So in general this Hadīth is considered weak, but we have evidence from the Qur'ān and Sunnâh that any written matter should begin with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm and then go straight to the matter. The Alhamdulilâhi Rabī al-'Ālamīn and the Salāt on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), none of this is narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or the Sahābah when it comes to written matters, so it should begin with Bismillâhi al-Rahmāni al-Rahīm, and straight into whatever the letter or whatever the book is about, but when it comes to speaking, it should begin with Innâ al-Hamdulilâh or Alhamdulilâh, it should begin with that, and there shouldn't be a Bismillâh or there shouldn't be **"A'ūthubillâhi min al-Shaytāni al-Rajīm"** and so on, because none of this is narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so we have separate for each thing, or different things, so with regards to written, it begins with the Basmallâh, and with regards to speaking, it begins with the Hamd. And it can be done **"Innâ al-Hamda Lillâh"** because that's narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), or also **"Alhamdulilâh"** and so on, so this is just a few matters to mention about the Basmallâh and that's why it would be begun in this poetry, and that Hadīth that I mentioned from Anas(رضي الله عنه) is narrated by Imām Muslim(رحمه الله).

Next, the author says:

أبدأُ بالحمدِ مُصَلِّياً على ** مُحمَّدٍ خَيرِ نبيْ أُرسِلا

Or that **"Begin I due with praise and prayers and salutations on Muhammad, the noble Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), the finest ever commissioned"**,

And just keep in mind when you're reading this, the person who translated this appears to have tried to keep the poetic nature of the poem, so it might not flow the way we would speak, so that's why it may not seem normal to the

way we speak, but it seems that if you read through the translation that he tried his best to keep it in a poetic nature or keep the poetic nature of this poem.

What the author mentions, is that he begins with the Hamd, so al-Hamd is to extol, to praise based upon characteristics. So when we say Alhamdulilâh, it can be the hamd or this extollation or this extolling of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or praising him, doesn't need to be directly in response to a virtue or a favour that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) gave us.

So you can say Alhamdulilâh just based upon Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى)'s characteristics or His greatness, it doesn't have to be only done, or in order to make sense it doesn't have to be done just after a virtue is given to you as opposed to thanks. So if we say the Shukr linguistically is done in response to something that was done or a virtue that was given to you, so if Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) gives you something good and you can thank Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) and you can praise, but it doesn't make sense that you wouldn't thank Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or give him shukr based upon his greatness, because thanks or al-shukr is in a direct response to a virtue that was given to you, so when we say the hamd is more general than the shukr, because it can be done in response to a virtue that was given to you, so if Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) gives you something good, you can thank Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) and you can praise him, but it doesn't make sense that you thank Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or give him Shukr based upon his greatness, because a thanks or a shukr is in direct response to a virtue that was given to you, so when we say al-Hamd is more general than the shukr, because it can be done in response to a virtue that was given to you, if Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) gives you something good, you can say Alhamdulilâh, and if he doesn't give you something good and you are just wanting to praise him in general, you can also say Alhamdulilâh, so it's more general than shukr in that sense, but it's more specific in other matters.

So this is a matter of dispute among the scholars, but some say that shukr can be done with the tongue and with the body and with the heart, so you can thank Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) with your tongue by saying thanks or by saying thank you, and you can thank him with your actions because if he does something good for you, then by doing good as a thanks to him, and also in your heart, so by having that thanks in your heart while when it comes to praise, they say it

would only be done in some of these matters, and again this is a matter of dispute, the most important thing to understand about all this though is that the hamd is in response to anything, whether it's a virtue or just a means of praising Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), that it's more general in that sense.

And we know that praising Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or saying hamd to him is a matter that would be a cause for the acceptance of a du'ā of a person, and this is based upon the Hadīth of Fudhālah ibn 'Ubayd(رضي الله عنه) that he said:

<div dir="rtl">

سمع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم رجلاً يدعو في صلاته

</div>

Or that **"the messenger of Allâh(صلى الله عليه وسلم) heard a man supplicating in his Salāt"**:

<div dir="rtl">

لم يمجد الله تعالى ولم يصل على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

</div>

And that **"he did not praise Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or send blessings upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم)"**

<div dir="rtl">

فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عجل هذا

</div>

Or "**the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: this one rushed**" or "**this one was too hasty**"...

<div dir="rtl">

ثم دعاه فقال له أو لغيره إذا صلى أحدكم فليبدأ بتحميد ربه عز وجل والثناء عليه ثم يصلي على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثم يدعو بعد بما شاء

</div>

That the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) "**then called this person and said to him or to someone else: If any of you performs his Salāh, then let him begin by praising Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) and exalting him, then let him send blessings upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then let him supplicate with whatever he wishes**"

And that's narrated by Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله), Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) and al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله) & he authenticated it, and it was also narrated by Ibn Hibbān(رحمه الله) in his Sahīh. So we see here that the **Hamd** or the beginning of the **Hamd** can be a cause of acceptance for the du'ā of the believer, and also the Salāt upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) which was mentioned in that Hadīth specifically, and also we know that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

<div dir="rtl">

إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَمَلائِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا صَلُّوا عَلَيْهِ وَسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا

</div>

Or in Surat al-Ahzab verse 56, Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

"Indeed Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) sends his Salāh on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and as do his angels as well, O you who believe, send your Salāt on him and greet him with the Salām"

So Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) commanded the believers to send Salāt upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), the only dispute is when is it obligatory, if the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم)'s name is mentioned, is it obligatory to send blessings upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) at this point, or would it be merely recommended at this point, and we're not going to get into that right now, but in any case, at the very least it's extremely recommended or extremely recommended to mention or to send the blessings upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) whenever he's mentioned. So this is when the author mentioned that he begins by praising Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) and sending blessings upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), this is what it's based upon.

Next he said:

<div dir="rtl">

خَيِّر نبيْ أُرسِلا

</div>

Or **"the best Prophet that was ever sent"**,

So this is based upon what we talked about in the 'Aqīdah lessons, in that every messenger is a Prophet, but not necessarily every Prophet is a messenger, but we know that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was both, he was a

Prophet and he was a Messenger, so he said the best Messenger or the best Prophet that was ever sent, so we know that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was a Prophet and he was sent, so this is what this is based upon, and there is a consensus of the scholars that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the best of any Prophet that was ever sent, so this is a matter of consensus, the only difference of opinion is, is he better than every other Prophet put together or is he merely better than every Prophet individually, and Allâhu a'lam, he is better than all of human kind put together and that's based upon a Hadīth that we talked about as well before, in which the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was put on one of the sides of the scale, and all the other people were put on the other side of the scale and he outweighed them, so the only way this wouldn't apply to the issue of the Anbiyā' is if the people put in the scale were only this Ummâh and not the earlier Umäm(nations), Allâhu a'lam, we'll leave that for another time, that's more of a 'Aqīdah issue, that doesn't necessarily have to come into this issue or come into this topic. There's one point to mention here though, is the Hadīth in which the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

لا تفضلوا بين أنبياء الله فإنه ينفخ في الصور فيصعق من في السموات ومن في الأرض إلا من شاء الله

Or that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

"Do not say that some of the Prophets are better than the rest of the Prophets" till the end of the Hadīth...

And this Hadīth is agreed upon, so if we know that there is a consensus that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the best of the Prophets, but then the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

"Do not say that any of the Prophets are better than others"

How do we reconcile between these two matters, that if there is a consensus, how can there be a consensus on something that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) told us not to do, so this is a matter that some of the scholars have talked about, and the best explanation to this is that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this out of humility as a means to not say that he is better than everyone else,

because it's from his humility and we know that he was a humble servant of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), and also because it might lead to some matters that might lead to pride and that our Prophet is better than yours so we are better than you, or people might even go further and use the virtue of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) as a means to insult other Prophets, because if we say that this Prophet is better than this one, and this one is better than this one, things might come to the discussion where we're mentioning certain sins or certain shortcomings that some of the Prophets had.

So we know that Ādam(عليه السلام) was sent out of the Jannâh, and we know that Nūh(عليه السلام) made du'â or asked Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) to save his son, and Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) rebuked him for that, and so on and so on, so if we start then saying that this one is better than this one and this one is better than this one, we're going to then need to say, well why is he better. And one of the points that might come into that is saying, well why is he lower or what would make this person lower, what would make this Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) lower than another one, and we're going to begin to start discussing some of the shortcomings that they had, so they say that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this as a means to keep the Muslimīn away from having any sort of bad thoughts about the Prophets of Allâh(عليهم الصلاة والسلام) so this is what I'll just mention about that verse of the poetry.

Next, the author mentions or he says:

<div dir="rtl">

وذِي مِنَ أقسَامِ الحديث عدَّة ** وكُلُّ واحدٍ أتى وحدَّه

</div>

Or that the author said:

"So what follows are a number of Hadīth/divisions and all of them do come with their definitions"

So he's saying that from here, he's going to begin mentioning the types of Hadīth along with their definitions and that there are a number of types of Ahādīth, so this is what the author mentions here.

So with regards to the different types of Ahādīth, there's many different ways of dividing the Ahādīth and putting them into their different categories that they might fall into. Ibn Kathīr(رحمه الله) mentioned that early on in the Ummâh

there was only 2 types of Hadīth, there was authentic and weak, or there was Sahīh and Da'īf, and the point of that is, is that either we accept it as a Hadīth or we don't accept it, there's nothing in-between, either we're saying this is from the Sharī'ah or it's not from the Sharī'ah, so really in the end, there's only 2 types of Hadīth, but later on their began to have other definitions or other categorisations of Ahādīth, and it became known that there was Sahīh and Hassan and Da'īf, so the Sahīh, Hassan and Da'īf, we'll talk about those soon with regards to their conditions, but the Sahīh would be something that we accept at the highest level, Hassan would be we accept it but it's at a lower level of Sahīh or then the Sahīh, then Da'īf would be one that we don't accept, so this is what is meant when we say the types of Hadīth.

And when we say Sahīh and Hassan and Da'īf or whatever categorisation we give them with regards to their authenticity, this can apply to Ahādīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), as well as Ahādīth from the Sahābah and the Tābi'īn and so on, so they can be authentic or they can be weak, they can be made up, they can be whatever categorisation we want to give them concerning their authenticity, it would apply to all of them. But what we need to understand here is that when we say the word Hadīth, what does this mean. Does it mean anything that is narrated, does it mean that it's from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), what does this mean.

Generally nowadays and even from I guess you could call the Khalaf, so from the later scholars of Ahādīth, the word Hadīth began to mean something that was narrated to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so whenever the word Hadīth was mentioned, that was the word that was used, but if it was from the Sahābah or the Tābi'īn or anyone after that, they began to use the word Athar, and this was mentioned by al-Nawawī(رحمه الله) and others that they would use the word Athar, so they began to use different terminologies, so something from the Sahābah, they would say was an Athar, and something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was a Khabar or a Hadīth, and Imām al-Nawawi (رحمه الله) & others mention that the first people that had this differentiation between this terminology were the scholars of Fiqh from Khurasān, which is modern day Afghānistān and parts of Irān, and that area there. So before up until those scholars, anything was considered a Hadīth or a Khabar, it was all considered the same, except that they would say it's a Hadīth from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه

وسلم), it's a Hadīth from 'Omar(رضي الله عنه), it's a Hadīth from 'Uthmān (رضي الله عنه) and so on, so this differentiation came later on.

And the importance of knowing that is that if we're looking at something, we need to understand the terminology of the person who's using it, so if we look at somebody now and he says that there's a Hadīth about that, most likely he's referring to something that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said or did, but if we see Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) or Yahyâ ibn Ma'īn(رحمه الله) or some of the early early scholars, and they say that there's a Hadīth about this or "I have a Hadīth on this topic", it doesn't mean that it's from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it might be from a Sahābī, it might even be from a Tābi'ī, so that's why it's important to know the terminology of the person who you're looking into their words, but generally the early, early scholars used Hadīth for any narration and the later scholars began to use the word Hadīth only for the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

And the author of this poetry, or the poet here said that he's going to mention the types of Hadīth. He mentioned 32 types in this poem, so he mentions 32 types of Hadīth which we'll go through each one of them Inshā'Allâh. Some of the other scholars have said that there's 49 types of Hadīth, ibn al-Salāh mentioned that there are 64 types of Hadīth and some of them even went further up into the hundreds, but Allâhu a'lam, that's an exaggeration, and it's taking general categories and dividing them more and more and more to the point that you get that many types of Hadīth as we'll see. The point of knowing the types of Hadīth isn't to see how many types of Hadīth we can get the categorisations up too, the point is just to make things easier in understanding what is authentic and what isn't and how we deal with the Ahādīth of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), as well as those from the Sahābah(رضي الله عنهم).

So the author begins the first type of Hadīth, he says:

<div dir="rtl">

أَوَّلُها (الصحيحُ) وهوَ ما اتَّصَلْ ** إسنادُهُ ولْم يُشَذّ أو يُعلّ

</div>

Or that **"The first of them is the sound..."**

So he translates Sahīh here as sound, generally I've been using the word authentic, but whatever you find is being more acceptable, you can use whatever translation you want. He says:

"The first of them is sound, and that is neither broken in its chain nor does it contradict or have a hidden failing"

And then he says:

<div dir="rtl">

يَرْويهِ عَدْلٌ ضَابِطٌ عَنْ مِثْلِهِ ** مُعْتَمَدٌ في ضَبْطِهِ ونَقْلِهِ

</div>

Or that **"One who is upright and precise narrates from his like, reliable in his precision as well as his transmission"**

So here the author is mentioning that the first type of Hadīth is what is authentic and then he gives the conditions for an authentic Hadīth. So this is now the first thing that we'll mention about the Ahādīth, what are the conditions for a Hadīth to be authentic? Generally the most widespread categorisation of these conditions for a Hadīth to be authentic, they gave it 5 conditions, so in order for a Hadīth to be authentic, 5 conditions need to be met. The first is the justness of the narrators or the 'Adālah, so I'm just translating it as justness, if you want to use whatever translation you find as being more precise for yourself, you can use, but meaning that the narrators are just, so this relates to their religion, so meaning that in their religion, they are considered just, and in order for a person to be considered just, in order for them to be 'Adl or for their 'Adālah to be accepted, there's a number of conditions as well, and generally there's 4 conditions for them to be considered just.

The first is that the person is a muslim, so a non muslim wouldn't be considered just and if they narrate a Hadīth, their Hadīth would be rejected, so if we find in the chain that there's a non muslim whether they're originally non-muslim or that they're an apostate, that they do or say or believe something that has taken them out of islam, then this chain of narration would be rejected, and likewise the Hadīth itself would be rejected because this would be something that takes them out of being just.

The second is that they're of sound mind, so they don't have any sort of defect in their mind that would make their testimony or their narration to be rejected.

The third is that they're of age, and generally we'll keep it as a condition, there's some dispute on that but we'll keep it as that for now, so meaning that they need to be over-age.

The fourth is that they're free from Fisq, so meaning they don't have any Fisq or any transgression that would make them to be considered a Fāsiq, which would mean that they don't commit major sins, and they don't commit minor sins, or they don't continuously stay upon the minor sins. So if they commit a minor sin, they stop it afterwards or they seek forgiveness for it, they don't continuously perform minor sins.

And then the last condition for them to be considered a just narrator is that they are free from shameful behaviours, so this would be something that goes back to the culture of the people, so if you see them within their society, do they do things which people consider to be shameful, do they dress in a certain way that is considered rejected, do they speak or act or deal with people in a way that's considered unacceptable socially or culturally and so on.

So these are the 5 conditions in order for a person to be considered a just narrator, and that's the 1st of the 5 conditions for the Hadīth to be considered authentic.

Student: What was the 5th one?

Shaykh: The 5th is that they're free from shameful acts or behaviours, so meaning it might not be something Harām but culturally and socially, they don't do things which make them to be considered someone who is rejected as a person, so people don't accept what he says and he's kind of an outcast kind of person.

The second condition is the precision of the narrators, so this has less to do with their religion and more to do with their actual narrating of things, so what this means is that when they narrate something, they have a very, very small number of mistakes. So we know that everyone will have mistakes in what they narrate, but the mistakes that they have are much less than what they

narrate correctly. So this is tested by comparing it to other narrators, so for example if you find someone that he narrates say 100 Hadīth, and you find another 10 people narrating the same 100 Hadīth, you find 8 of them relate it exactly the same, and then 2 of these other people have something completely different to what everybody else has. Obviously you can say that there's something wrong with this person's narrations, he's not narrating them correctly, all these other people who are also trustworthy, none of them are liars, none of them are Kuffār or anything like this, they are all agreeing on how this Hadīth was narrated, but then this 1 person comes and has something completely different, obviously this is considered a mistake then. So that's the way that the precision would be tested or the way they would reach or how they would come to understand whether this person was considered precise or not, and the scholars, they divide precision into 2 types. And precision, I'm using the Arabic word for it, Dabt, I'm just translating it as precision, so they say that there's 2 types of Dabt:

The first is in regards to their memory, so this means that if you went up to someone and said **"could you narrate to me the Hadīth of so and so"**, he would have it right in his mind just like that, he wouldn't have to go check a book, and he would narrate it correctly, we would say that this person has Dabt in their memory.

Another type is Dabt in their writings; because many of the scholars of Hadīth earlier, the early scholars of Hadīth would write down their Ahādīth from their shaykhs and then they would narrate it from their book as well, so this would have to be that when they narrate something down, they write it down correctly, they don't have mistakes all throughout their writing, they check with their Shaykh to verify whether what they wrote down was correct or they check it based upon narrations from other students to verify that what they heard was correct.

And the earlier scholars used to prefer whenever possible to narrate from books as opposed to narrate from memory. And that's obvious the reason why, because if you write something down and then check it and then you keep your book safe from it being changed by anybody adding something onto it that wasn't from it, then this is going to be a lot more precise compared to something in your memory, because over time if you don't review the Ahādīth

that you've memorised, that you might forget something or you might mix something up. With regards to the book though, the only time it would be changed is if someone actually changes it on you, and this is actually something which would take place, so the scholars would always advise their students to keep their books safe and keep them hidden from people and only take them out when they're reviewing them or when they're narrating to other people because people would sometimes try to ruin the narrations of other narrators by adding things into it and so on, so this is why it was important at the time.

The third condition for a Hadīth to be considered authentic is that the chain is connected, so meaning that each person in the chain did actually narrate from the person ahead of them up to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so there's no breaks in the chain, and this was known in a number of ways, so first of all if a trustworthy narrator says **"I heard so and so say"**, then we take him at his word and we say that we accept that he heard this from that narrator or if he says **"I saw so and so and asked him about this"** so all of these types of ways in narrating, they indicate that there's a connection in the chain, because he's saying **"I heard it from him"** or **"I saw him"** or **"I asked him"** or **"He told me"**, if the person is trustworthy, then we can take this at its face value as being something that indicates that the narration is connected. Likewise, other ways they check the connection of the narration is based upon the birth dates and dates of death, so if you have a person who died in 100AH, and then the person who's narrating from him was born a year after that person died, obviously we know that there's something wrong in that chain, because how could it be that he narrates from somebody who he wasn't alive at the same time, or if you look and say they were living at the same time, but they lived in different cities or different countries and the higher narrator died while the other person was 10 years old, it's highly unlikely that this person at that age travelled to another country and narrated this Hadīth at 10 years of age and so on, so they would look at these things as means to determine the connectedness of the chain and whether there was any break in the chain.

The fourth condition is that there is a lack of defects or a lack of **'ilal**, so the defect is a **'ila** and the plural of 'ila is 'ilal, so they say that there's no 'ilal in the Hadīth, so generally when we say that there's a 'ila in the Hadīth, this would apply to any defect, so if the person's a liar, if the person's a Kāfir, if the person

has a bad memory, if the person never met the other person, all of these are considered to be defects in a Ḥadīth, but when they mention it here, we give it a specific meaning though, because obviously we talked about the justness of the narrators, and the precision of the narrators and the connectedness of the chain, so it wouldn't make sense for us to then come and say that there's no defects in it because we already talked about 3 possible defects, so in this situation or in this context when they mention that there's no defect, they mean no hidden defects, so for example, certain narrators would be considered trustworthy or acceptable narrators if they narrated from the people of their city, but if they narrated it from another city, their Ḥadīth would be considered rejected. And the reason for this would be, maybe they travelled to this other city when they were old and they were senile, so anything in this place is considered authentic, if they narrate it from narrators of another city, obviously they travelled when they were senile, we reject their Ḥadīths, so these are considered more hidden defects because it takes a lot more precision of a scholar of Ḥadīth to look at this and say, because if you just look at it and say **"okay well this person did travel to this town, he was alive obviously at the time, the person who narrated from him, he was alive at the time, so there's no break in the chain, he was considered trustworthy, he was considered trustworthy, he had a good memory, he had a good memory, so what's the problem, we accept all the Aḥādīth that he narrated when he was in his town, so then why would we reject the other one"** Generally you look at that, there's no problem with it, but then you look, okay well he was senile, he was only senile when he went to this town and narrated from these people, or the person who narrated from him did when he was senile and that type of thing, so this would be considered a ʿila or a hidden defect.

Student: What do you mean by senile?

Shaykh: You know, when someone gets old and their mind isn't completely there, so when they were in their town, their mind was sharp, then later on they moved somewhere else and at that point, the sharpness of their mind wasn't there anymore, so we wouldn't accept from people who narrated in that state.

And this is something that if you look throughout history, not many scholars would pick up on these things, so if we look, say 10,000 scholars of Ḥadīth,

maybe 1,500 would be someone who you would look to figure out these details about the 'ilal or the defects of the Hadīth, and some of the main ones that we look too even up to today, al-Shu'bah ibn al-Hajjāj(رحمه الله), Ahmad ibn Hanbal(رحمه الله), al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله), Muslim(رحمه الله), Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله), al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله), Yahya ibn Sa'īd al-Qattān(رحمه الله), Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh (رحمه الله), Sufyān al-Thawrī(رحمه الله) and so on. But if you look, there are a very few number of scholars that we would say that they were actual scholars of the defects of Hadīth, even in the past, so nowadays the further you get from the Salaf, obviously that number would go down to the point where it's a very, very small minority of scholars of Hadīth that have a strong knowledge with regards to the defects of Hadīth.

And the last condition for a Hadīth to be considered authentic is that it's free from abnormalities or irregularities, and this, I'm translating it from **"Shuthūth"** or so that the Hadīth isn't **Shāth**, so if the Hadīth is Shāth or it has Shuthūth within the Hadīth, we say there's an irregularity or abnormality in the Hadīth, and this is when a narrator contradicts other narrators that are either more in numbers or they're more precise in their narration or both. So if you have 1 narrator narrating something, but 15 other narrators narrated the same Hadīth without mentioning something, generally you would say it's more likely that the larger number is correct and the smaller number is incorrect. So even the chain itself can be considered an authentic chain, but this would be considered another defect that we would reject the Hadīth with, so this is the 5th condition that needs to be met in order for a Hadīth to be considered authentic.

Next, the author mentions or he goes into defining what Hassan Hadīth is, but Inshā'Allâh we'll stop there and we'll continue that on Thursday, Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 2:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له

<p dir="rtl" style="color:red; text-align:center; font-weight:bold">وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله</p>

<p dir="rtl" style="color:red; text-align:center; font-weight:bold">اما بعد:</p>

So last time we finished with talking about the conditions for Aḥādīth to be considered authentic, and we mentioned that there is 5 conditions, some of them relate to the narrators themselves and some of them relate to the chain, so that's where we ended off. So just to give an example of an authentic Hadīth, one is that Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) narrated, he said Ādam ibn Abī Iyās(رحمه الله) narrated to us, that he said Shu'bah(رحمه الله) narrated to us, from 'Abdûl 'Azīz ibn Suhayb(رحمه الله) that he said I heard Anas(رضي الله عنه) saying the Messenger of Allâh(صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to say when he would go into the washroom:

<p dir="rtl" style="color:red; text-align:center; font-weight:bold">اللهم اني اعوذ بك من الخبث والخبائث</p>

So this is a Hadīth, it's narrated by al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) as well as the other narrators from the six books and Imām Ahmad, and this chain belongs to Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله), so this is an example of an authentic chain, all of the narrators in it are considered trustworthy and their memory is considered acceptable or at the height of strong memory, and all of them had met each other, and there's no hidden defects in this chain and there's no irregularities or it doesn't contradict any other narrations, so this is an example of an authentic Hadīth.

So the next thing that the author mentions, he says:

<p dir="rtl" style="color:purple; text-align:center; font-weight:bold">وَ(الَحسَنُ) المَعْرُوفُ طُرُقاً وغَدَتْ ** رِجَالُهُ لا كالصّحيح اشْتَهَرَتْ</p>

 Or that, "the tradition", so he translates here tradition as being Hadīth I guess,

"The tradition that is fair..."

So he translates Hassan as fair

"...Is one whose routes are known, its narrators not as famous as the sound have shown"

So he's saying here that a narration that is Hassan or fair, he's giving the conditions in his opinion are the ones whose routes are known, so meaning the chains of narration or the men in the chains of narration are well known, but they are not as famous as the ones that would be in an authentic Hadīth, so this is the definition that this author, al-Bayqūnī(رحمه الله) gives.

So just to talk a bit about what is a Hassan Hadīth, generally the Hassan Hadīth has the same conditions for it to be considered Hassan as a Sahīh Hadīth would have, the only difference is the accuracy or the precision of the narrators would be lower than that of an authentic Hadīth, so meaning the dabt that we talked about a few days ago wouldn't be as strong as the narrators that we would say for an authentic Hadīth, so meaning that their mistakes would be a little bit more than a narrator whose Hadīth would be considered Sahīh, but their mistakes aren't so much that it would bring them down to being a weak narrator, so meaning if we say for example a narrator whose Hadīth would be authentic, we would say he makes 1 mistake out of every 10, someone whose Hassan would be maybe say 3 out of every 10, and someone whose weak would be 5 or more out of every 10, so just to give an example of that and that's not an actual rule, it's just a way that I try and explain it to show that, we're not saying that the person cannot have any mistakes. We're saying that the less mistakes they have, the stronger they are, but if their mistakes get to a point where it's a large amount, then obviously they can't be trusted to narrate Ahādīth, so that's generally the difference between a Hassan and a Sahīh Hadīth. And this definition that the author al-Bayqūnī(رحمه الله) gave, it's actually taken from the definition of an earlier scholar whose name is al-Khattābī(رحمه الله), so his definition came essentially from that scholar and the definition of a Hassan Hadīth to actually nail down a precise, accurate definition of it is something that the scholars have differed upon greatly.

Many different scholars have many different definitions of what a Hassan Hadīth is, so for example, al-Khattābī(رحمه الله) had his own definition, Imām al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله) had his own definition, Imām ibn al-Jawzī(رحمه الله) had his own, ibn al-Salāh(رحمه الله) has his own definition, so there's many ways that they defined it, but just to go with some of the ones that are more well known or that are more wide-spread amongst the people, I'll just go through a few of those.

So first one, the definition that al-Khattābī(رحمه الله) made and I'll start with that one because that's the one that the author followed, so what al-Khattābī (رحمه الله), his definition of what a Hassan Hadīth was:

"That which the Makhraj of the Hadīth is known..."

And the Makhraj, I'll explain it in a second, but i'll just translate it as the outlet. So:

"That which the makhraj(outlet) of the Hadīth is known, and most of the Ahādīth come from this outlet and its men are famous, and most scholars accept it and all of the Fuqahā' use it"

So this is the definition al-Khattābī(رحمه الله) gave for a Hassan Hadīth, so the first thing that he said was, I'll just go through them and explain it, that the Makhraj is well known, so what is the makhraj when we talk about the Hadīth or the outlet when we talk about a Hadīth? For example it's the person or the narrator in a country or a city that most of the Ahādīth come through, so for e.g. in 'Irāq, there would be a number of scholars who the vast majority of the Ahādīth that were in 'Irāq came from these scholars, because they would have studied under scholars elsewhere and brought the Ahādīth with them to 'Irāq and likewise in al-Madīnah and Makkâh and so on.

So for e.g. just to make it easier to give a better example, in al-Basra which is a place in 'Irāq, the makhraj or the main scholar of Hadīth was Qatādah ibn Da'āmah al-Sadūsī(رحمه الله), so if you look at the narrators that were in al-Kūfah, the vast majority of their Ahādīth would come from Qatādah(رحمه الله), or he was the makhraj i guess you could call him for al-basra. In al-Kūfah, there was Abu Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله), and in Bilād al-Shām there was Al-Awzā'ī (رحمه الله), and in Egypt there was al-Layth ibn Sa'd(رحمه الله), and in Makkah there was ibn Jurayj(رحمه الله) and so on.

So what al-Khattābī(رحمه الله) was saying is that in order for a Hadīth to be Hassan, one of the conditions is that the makhraj or the person who these Ahādīth come through is well known, so that's the first condition that he gave.

Then the next condition that he mentioned was that the men in the chain are famous, so if they were not well-known, then the Hadīth can't be considered Hassan. However, most of the scholars rejected this definition and one of the

reasons is that it doesn't differentiate between what is considered an authentic Hadīth, and what's considered a Hassan and what's considered a weak, because if the Hadīth, if the makhraj or the main narrator of the Hadīth is well known, that doesn't make it Hassan, it could still be Sahīh or it could be weak because later down the chain there could be a major defect in the chain, so just saying that its makhraj or its outlet or the main narrator of the Hadīth is well known, doesn't tell us anything about what a Hassan Hadīth would be.

And likewise with the men of the chain being well known, he didn't specify well known with what, for example because there's a narrator named ibn Lahī'ah(رحمه الله), that he's well known as well, but he's well known as being a weak narrator, he's one of the most famous weak narrators, so everyone would know him, but in the end he's weak, so does him being well known help the Hadīth being authentic? It doesn't really in the end, because sure he's well known, but everyone knows don't take his Hadīth, so how well known you are, how many people know who you are doesn't really tell you anything about whether the Hadīth is authentic or weak, it could make it authentic but it could make it extremely weak, if someone's well known for being a liar, that doesn't tell us anything right.

Student: So by outlet, see the main narrator, does that mean the last person?

Shaykh: No, for e.g. It might be the Tābi'ī, so the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something and then the Sahābah took it from them, then the Tābi'īn would take it from the Sahābah and then go to their lands, so they would be now the outlet for everything, every Hadīth that was passed later on would come through this Tābi'ī, so that's essentially what it would mean.

Even though it's weird to say a definition, then talk about how it's wrong, but the reason i mentioned that is because essentially it's the same definition that the author mentioned, because the author mentioned that the men should be well known, but they're not as well known as the narrators of an authentic Hadīth, so really this is some kind of a definition that's lacking in its accuracy, but a more correct definition and it includes, or it would kind of encompass the meaning of a Hassan Hadīth a lot better is what ibn Hajr(رحمه الله) defined it as, he said:

"A Hassan Hadīth is that which has a connected chain, and the narrators are trustworthy(or that they are just – 'adl), but the precision or the accuracy of this narrator is less or it's not complete, and that they narrate this from people like them to the end of the chain..."

Student: Could you repeat that again please?

Shaykh: Yep, **"That which has a connected chain from a just narrator who lacks accuracy from someone like him to the end of the chain without any Shuthūth(irregularities) or 'ila(defects)"**

So it's essentially the same definition as the authentic Hadīth except that the accuracy of some of the narrators would be less, so by giving it this type of definition, it excludes the weak Hadīth because we've said it can't have a defect, it can't have Shuthūth, that the chain is connected so we've excluded weak Hadīth.

We've also given a reason as to why it's not considered Sahīh because the precision or the accuracy of the narrator isn't as high as an authentic Hadīth, so this is a better definition because as you can see, it excludes what shouldn't be included and it includes what should be included. And some add the extra condition that the accuracy shouldn't be so low that the person is a type of narrator that if he's the one that narrates something, we would reject it. So meaning that he can have mistakes but if he has the type of mistakes but if he has the amount of mistakes to the point that if he is the only one who narrates something that we say it's probably a mistake, then this wouldn't be considered Hassan, it would be considered weak, so this is just an extra condition that some people give. And then, just an example of some famous chains that are considered Hassan, we've talked about them a lot in the Fiqh class.

For e.g: **'Amr ibn Shu'ayb(رحمه الله) from his father from his grandfather**, This is considered a Hassan chain, so as long as there's no defects in the rest of the chain, this would be considered Hassan.

And likewise from **Bahz ibn Hakīm(رحمه الله) from his father from his grandfather**, this is also considered to be a Hassan chain or a Hassan number

of men or if this is in the chain and there's no other defects, then this chain would be considered Hassan.

And then just to end the Hassan and the Sahīh discussion, any Hadīth that is deemed authentic or even if it's Hassan, then there's a consensus that we act upon it. So if someone says this is a Hassan Hadīth so we don't need to act upon it, we reject this idea because when we say that it's Hassan, then we're saying that it is confirmed from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so if it's confirmed from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then obviously we have to act upon it. And the fact that one of the narrators might have a few more mistakes than we would like, as long as we're saying that it's from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), then we can't reject it and there's a consensus that we act upon it, so this is for the Hassan, so if there are any questions before we go on? No, okay.

So then he says or he continues, he says:

وكُلُّ ما عَنْ رُتبةِ الُحسْنِ قَصْر ** فَهْوَ (الضعيفُ) وهوَ أَقْسَاماً كُثُرْ

Or in the transliterate mentions it as:

"And all that falls below the rank of a fair tradition, weak it is, falling short with many sub-divisions"

So meaning, he's saying that anything that falls below a Hassan Hadīth would be considered weak and that it's many different sub-divisions, so the weak Hadīth would have many different categories and it wouldn't be just one category, so this is his definition of the Hassan. Some other definitions that are given essentially prove the same thing, some people say a weak Hadīth is whatever is lower than Hassan, ibn Hajr(رحمه الله) mentioned that a weak Hadīth is that which doesn't have the characteristics that would make it acceptable, so really in the end the point is that it doesn't meet the conditions of authenticity or it being a Hassan Hadīth. Anything that doesn't meet these conditions, however you want to define it that this would fall into a weak Hadīth.

So as the author mentioned, there are many sub-divisions or that there's many different types of weak Hadīth, we can say that there's different weaknesses or different types of weak Hadīth depending on what we're talking about, so

some might be weak due to the chain like the actual connection in the chain, and others might be weak due to the narrators themselves.

So first we'll start with the types of weaknesses that are related to the chain or the actual chain of narration itself. So there are 6 types of weak Hadīth that would be related to the chain, and we'll end up going through most of them so I'll mention them quickly with the definition of each.

So the first is what's called Mu'allâq and translate that as Hanging or dangling, and we've talked a lot about this in our fiqh classes as well, Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) narrates many Mu'allâq Hadīth. So it is when the part of the beginning of the chain is missing, so if say there's 7 people in the chain, instead of the author mentioning all 7, he'll skip 1 and then mention the next 6 to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or 5 or 4, or even if someone says **"The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said" then** this would fall under a Mu'allâq because the beginning of the chain is missing. So they liken it to something if it's hanging up, if something was hanging from the ceiling or from the wall, it wouldn't be touching the ground, so the beginning of it, it's not actually touching, so the top part is here, the bottom part there's something missing, so that's why they call it Mu'allâq, and we'll get into a bit more detail later on.

The second type is a Mursal, and this can be translated as that it's sent or forwarded, and the general definition of it is that the Tābi'ī narrates something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

And the third type that's related to the chain is a Munqati', and that would be disconnected, so meaning there's someone missing in the chain, so there's a break in the chain.

And the fourth is a Mu'dhal, and we can translate it as, or the translator of this poem later translates it as problematic, and we'll get into the differences of opinion on it, but generally a Mu'dhal Hadīth is one in which there's 2 narrators missing in a row, or at least 2 narrators, so if there's 1 narrator missing, it would be considered Munqati' which is the third or #3. Mu'dhal, #4 would be something that there's 2 or more narrators missing in a row.

And the fifth type of defect or the weak Hadīth related to the chain would be Mudallâs, and we can translate that as cheated, and we'll get into this in some

detail later on, but just generally it's when a narrator narrates a Hadīth in a way that covers up a break in the chain, so there's a break in the chain, but he narrates it in a way that makes it unclear as to whether there's a break or not.

And the last related to the chain, we can call it or it's called Mursal Khafī, or it's a hidden or concealed forwarding, so like number 2 but it's a hidden one, and we'll get into detail of all of these, but I'll just give you the types for now and as we go through, we'll talk about each one in detail Inshā'Allâh.

So these are the types or the 6 types of weak Hadīth that could relate to the chain of narration or how the connectivity in the chain itself. Now to talk about the defects or the weaknesses that would be a cause for the narrator being considered weak, so as we talked about before, in order for the Hadīth to be considered authentic, it needs to have a connected chain and the narrators have to be just and accurate, so we talked about the defects in a chain and how it would have a break in the chain, so now we'll talk about the defects that would relate to the actual narrator them-self. So there's 2 types, the first is related to the justness to the person, and there's 5 types of accusations or 5 types of causes that a narrator would be considered weak.

The first is that he's a Fāsiq, so if a narrator is a Fāsiq or a transgressor, then his Hadīth would be considered rejected. So the first is that he's a Fāsiq as we've said and that Fāsiq can be two types, so the first is that he's a Kafir as Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

<div dir="rtl">

أَفَمَن كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا كَمَن كَانَ فَاسِقًا لا يَسْتَوُونَ

</div>

Or that **"is he who is a believer like him who is a Fāsiq, not equal are they"**

And that's from Sūrat al-Sajdah verse 18, so if a person is a non-muslim, then the Hadīth would be rejected and this would be whether they're a non-muslim to begin with like a Jew or a Christian or anything like that or whether they're a non-muslim as an apostate, so if they have done or said or believed things that take them outside of islam and it's confirmed that they are non-muslim, then the Hadīth would also be rejected and that's the first.

The second type of Fāsiq would be a muslim who commits major sins or commits minor sins and remains upon that, and I mean we can get into the

difference of opinion of what a Fāsiq is another time, but the evidence for that is when Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

$$يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَإٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَن تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ فَتُصْبِحُوا عَلَىٰ مَا فَعَلْتُمْ نَادِمِينَ$$

Or that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

"O you who believe, If a transgressing person comes to you..."

So meaning

"...if a Fāsiq comes to you with news, verify it lest you harm people in ignorance and afterwards you become regretful to what you have done"

And that's from Sūrat al-Hujrāt verse 6. So this is the first accusation or the first thing that a person would be described with that would render him an unacceptable narrator.

The second is that he's a confirmed liar, so it's confirmed that he's made up Hadīth before.

Student: Back in the day, did they used to have some sort of punishment for a person who used to make up Hadīth?

Shaykh: Well, there's a difference of opinion, most scholars say that it's a major sin, some scholars have said that it's actually an act of disbelief to make up Ahādīth, so it would depend, technically there was no specific punishment that would be given, generally the scholars would try to shame the person, make the person well known that this person actually makes up lies on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and just so that they would be well-known and people would shame them due to what they've done, but there's technically not a punishment for it.

Student: But wouldn't the second opinion you said kinda be Kufr if they said that because essentially they're making up a lie about Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى),

because a Hadīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is essentially from Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), right?

Shaykh: Yeah Yeah, so that's the argument for the ones who say it's Kufr, they say because you're attributing something to the Sharī'ah that this part of the religion and it's not, and not in the way like a Bid'ah in the sense that you think it's part of the religion, so you're acting upon it. You know that this is not part of it and you're just making it up, so that's the argument of ones who say that it's Kufr.

The third accusation or the third weakness that would be in a person is that he's accused of lying or accused of making up Ahādīth, so even if it's not confirmed, if there's enough doubt around a person that he lies or makes up Hadīth, then that's enough to not take accept the Ahādīth coming from this person, so even if you can't pinpoint that he's lied about this Hadīth, you don't have too if there's enough suspicion around a person due to a just cause then that would be sufficient to not accept his Hadīth.

The fourth is that he's an innovator or a mubtada', and this we'll get into at some point into the details because there's alot of dispute about what type of Bid'ah would make a person's narrations rejected, but in general we'll just keep it as being a defect and then we'll go onto it at another time.

And the fifth and final one that's related to his justness is that he's unknown, nothing's known about this person or not enough is known about him in order to declare his Ahādīth to be authentic. Because we know that by default we say that we don't accept something until we can prove it, because we're attributing something to the religion, so if the narrator is unknown we're not saying he's weak, but we can't prove that he's an acceptable narrator so we can't accept what he narrates.

So these are the 5 related to the justness of the narrator. The next section relates to the defects or the accusations against a narrator with regards to his precision or his accuracy, so the first one was related to his actual religion and whether we would accept what he says because we accept him as being truthful or a trustworthy narrator. The second part relates to, he might be a truthful person, but this now relates to his accuracy and actually conveying the Hadīth, and again in this section, there's 5 points that the scholars mention.

And just to mention to you that the further you go on, the more you might notice that some of the things that are mentioned as different categories, they might be the same or they might be connected in some way, but when I'm mentioning these categories, I'm just mentioning kind of the general accepted categorisation of things, so that if you then read on, you'll have heard of it before and you can build upon that, so just like in many things, we might take a basic concept and then later on the more you learn, the more you see that it might not be exactly as I learnt before, but we need to start somewhere to build a base and then build upon it. So the 5 that are mentioned:

The first is what they call **"Fuhsh al-Ghalat"** or obscene mistakes, so his mistakes are great in number, because we'll know that everyone will make mistakes, but if the person's mistakes are so great in number, then this person would be considered to be weak.

The second is **"Ghafla"** or negligence or carelessness, so the person just doesn't pay attention like they should, whether it's when they're writing, whether it's when the students are reciting upon him to take Ahādīth from him, however the carelessness or negligence manifests itself, the point is that this person just doesn't pay attention in the way that they should.

The third is just his bad memory.

And the fourth is that he makes contradictions of those who are more authentic narrators or stronger narrators than him, because even if someone's trustworthy and they might have a good memory, if they continuously make mistakes that go against everyone else, then it shows that something isn't right there.

And then the fifth and final one that they mentioned for this is **"wahm"** or I guess you can explain it as a mistake in perception or that they narrate something without being really surely if that's what it is, so they might have an idea that this is what the Hadīth is like and they narrate it anyway, so without being sure.

Student: So they're unsure of the meaning of the Hadīth?

Shaykh: Yeah like with the **"wahm"**, the scholars explain it in different ways, so I'm picking that as the explanation for it just to kind of give us a basis for it, so

meaning they don't know that the Hadīth is this way, but they narrate it in whatever way they think it is and just kind of hope for the best kind of thing.

So those are the 5 that are related to the person's accuracy as a narrator. And there are also other types of weaknesses that don't necessarily fit into these categories, for example the **"Maqlūb"** which is a Hadīth in which there's some sort of switching, either that something in the matn or the text of the Hadīth is switched in the order, or a name or something is switched in the chain, so if that person's name is Ka'b ibn Murrâh, he narrates it from Murrâh ibn Ka'b or Sa'd ibn Sinān, he narrates it from Sinān ibn Sa'd or something like this, so technically it's not really anything to do with his justness and it's not really a break in the chain, it's like a third category of miscellaneous of defects.

And then there's Shāth which we talked about before, that they contradict someone who narrates it differently, and there's Mudtarib which is that there's confusion like it's narrated in so many different ways where you can't really specify the correct way and there's many others, but this is just kind of a quick and easy introduction to the weak Hadīth.

And then just to give an example of a weak Hadīth, Imām al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله) and others, they narrated a Hadīth that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) supposedly said:

<div dir="rtl">

إِذَا رَأَيْتُمُ الرَّجُلَ يَتَعَاهَدُ الْمَسْجِدَ فَاشْهَدُوا لَهُ بِالإِيمَانِ

</div>

Or that:

"If you see a man continuously going to the Masjid or habitually going to the Masjid, then bear witness that he has Ēmān"

This is a weak Hadīth. The chain it has Abu al-Samh who narrated it from Abū al-Haytham, and the connection between the two or Abu al-Samh narrating from Abū al-Haytham is considered a weak Hadīth. So that's the discussion about the weak Hadīth in general, is there any questions?

Student: The brother asks about the terms the Shaykh mentioned...

Shaykh: Shāth, that's like when there's one narration one way from an authentic narration and then there's another narration of the same Hadīth

from acceptable people but it narrates it as a different way with an extra phrasing or a phrasing missing from it. It's like last time we talked about placing the hands on the chest, like the attribution of that to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) in that Hadīth, or the recitation of Sūrat al-Kahf on Friday, different things like that, so those would be considered Shāth. Mudtarib, we'll kinda get into that, it's a little bit long, it's like if you have for example a number of Ahādīth from a number of different people and they're all narrating it differently and you have no way of saying, **"well out of these 5 this is the correct one"**, they're all equal in your eyes so you can't decide or you have no way in telling which is the correct one, that will be considered Mudtarib, it's called confused or confusion.

Student: So it's like on one given topic you have 2 or 3 different aspects?

Shaykh: Well for example, say there's one Hadīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and from this path they attributed to ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) and from the same path but then there's a split in the path at some point, and note this person says no it's from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), so at this point, the lower down the chain you get, say for example if you're talking about the Tābi'īn and they can't decide on which Tābi'ī narrated it, I mean you have no way of telling which is the correct one, that would be considered an example of that, like a very general example of that.

And then next the author says:

$$\text{وما أُضيفَ للنبي (الَمرْفوعُ) ** وما لتَابِعٍ هُوَ (المقْطوعُ)}$$

Or **"attributed to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is the tradition that is raised..."**

So he translates Marfū' as raised, and then he says:

"…While falling on the successor, broken is it phrased"

So meaning if it's attributed to a Tābi'ī then we would call it Maqtū' or broken, so this is what the author translates it as, or the translator translates it as. So now we're going less or we're moving away from definitions that relate to the the authenticity of a Hadīth and we're moving into sections related to the

matn or the text of the Hadīth, so he's saying anything that's attributed to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), we would call it Marfū' and anything that's attributed to a Tābi'ī, we would call it Maqtū' and the reason for this is if someone says this is a Marfū' Hadīth then we know that this is from the statement or action of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but if someone says Yes, but this is a Maqtū' Hadīth or a Maqtū' narration, then we know that they're attributing it to a Tābi'ī and not to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) so this has less to do with the authenticity of a narration and more to do with who it's actually attributed too. And likewise if it's to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) it's called Marfū' regardless if it's authentic or not, so we can say it's a weak narration when it's Marfū', but it's authentic as Mawqūf, so meaning that it's weak that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said it, but it's authentic that this companion said it, and we've talked about some things like that before in the Fiqh, so this like i said has nothing to do with the authenticity, it only has to do with who it's actually narrated too.

I mean the Marfū' is clear, that's what our Dīn is based upon, is the Marfū' narrations essentially, so we don't need to get into too much about that because we already talked about that a bit, but just to add a bit about the Maqtū' narration. So it's anything that ends at the Tābi'ī, so anything that the Tābi'ī said or did or approved of, we would call it a Maqtū' narration, so for example if we said al-Hassan al-Basrī(رحمه الله) said such and such, or Sa'īd ibn Jubayr(رحمه الله) did such and such or he used to do this, so these are narrators from the Tābi'īn and we're attributing it to them. And narrations to the Tābi'īn can be a number of types, so they can be things that they said related to the Ghayb or to the hidden matters, they can be related to issues that are fiqh related or can be Ijtihād that have nothing to do with the Ghayb and they can also be narrations that are just explaining what they used to do. They used to do this or they used to say this or they used to like this and so on.

Student: What's your English translation for Maqtū'.

Shaykh: Maqtū', he translated it as broken.

So an example of a statement from a Tābi'ī that isn't related to the ghayb, it's just a matter of Ijtihād or his own judgement is that Muhammâd ibn Sīrīn(رحمه الله), he said:

إن هذا العلم دين فانظروا عمن تأخذون دينكم

Or that Muhammâd ibn Sīrin(رحمه الله), he's from the Imāms of the Tābi'īn:

"Indeed this knowledge is part of the religion, so think about those who you take your religion from"

And this is narrated by Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) in his introduction to his Sahīh. So the point here is that this is a statement from a Tābi'ī, it's not related to the ghayb, it's something that he's explaining saying this knowledge is part of the religion, so think about those who you take your religion from, so this is obviously a statement that could be right, it could be wrong, obviously I don't think anyone disputes that it's correct, but the point is that it was something he said of his opinion.

A second example is when it's related to the ghayb, so often you might find a statement from a Tābi'ī that relates to something of the ghayb or something that's unseen, and an example of this is from Sa'īd ibn Jubayr(رحمه الله) who is from the Imāms of the Tābi'īn that he said:

من قطع تميمة من إنسان كان كعدل رقبة

Or that **"Whoever cuts an amulet off of a person, then it is as if he freed a slave"**,

So obviously normally this is talking about the rewards for a certain action, so if we have evidence from the Qur'ān and Sunnâh about something specific, then we know that this is the reward for a specific action, but without that we can't say for sure. So here this is a statement from a Tābi'ī related to something from the ghayb, and that's narrated by ibn Abī Shaybah(رحمه الله) and Wakī'(رحمه الله).

And a third example or a third type of narration from a Tābi'ī that you might find is that they say something related to what they used to do or what they used to say and so on, so an example of that is Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī(رحمه الله), who again is from the Imāms of the Tābi'īn, he said:

كانوا يحبون أن يقرؤوا هؤلاء السور في كل ليلة ثلاث مرات: قل هو الله احد والمعوذتين

Or that Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī(رحمه الله) said:

"They used to like to recite these 3 Sūrah's at night 3 times, Qul Huwa Allâhu Ahad and the Mu'awithatayn[Sūrat al-Nās & Sūrat al-Falaq]"

<u>So Qul Aʿūthu bi Rabī al-Falaq and Qul Aʿūthu bi Rabī al-Nās</u>, and that's narrated by Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) and it's authentic, so this is a matter that is not related to the ghayb and it's not related to their own opinion, he's just explaining that this is something that they used to like to do, so just to end or we'll end on this issue of the Tābiʿīn.

If they make a statement that is related to their own opinion, then we give it the same weight for any other scholars, so yes, they would be higher than other scholars in the sense that they are the students of the Sahābah, so they would have that weight and would have that prestige, but in the end, we don't give their statements the same weight as we would for the Sahābah.

So the Sahābah, if they say something and no one contradicted them, then we would say according to the strongest opinion, this is a proof for something, but when it gets to the Tābiʿīn we don't say that anymore, because we don't have anything from the Qurʾān giving Tazkiyyäh to them or giving approval to them, and we don't necessarily know their teachers like they might've had Sahābah for their teachers, they also might've had other Tābiʿīn. There's alot less weight given to their statements as with the Sahābah, but at the same time they are scholars and they are at the height of the scholars, but there's no proof in their statements as we would say there is for the companions. When it comes to statements related to the ghayb, there's a dispute as to if they say something, does this take the ruling of a Marfūʿ Hadīth, because as we will discuss when we talk about the statements of the companions, if they say something that can only be known from the ghayb, if it's from a companion and it's authentic, then we give it the ruling as if it came from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), because it's impossible that a companion would declare something about the ghayb unless they knew for sure that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) had said

this, but with regards to the Tābi'īn, there's a dispute, some of them say it would be the same as the Sahābah, but Allâhu a'lam, the stronger opinion is that it wouldn't be the same as the Sahābah, because they could be saying it that they've heard it from somewhere, or they could be saying it as their own Ijtihād and something that they think it should be like this, or they think something like this as opposed to the Sahābah, they have a much higher status and a much more prestige when it comes to these matters.

Then the last issue is about if they say, they used to like doing this, does this apply to the Sahābah or the Tābi'īn, I'm going to leave that for now just because that's more related to Usūl al-Fiqh, but we'll get into that at some point. This ends the discussion about the Marfū' and the Maqtū' and next time Inshā'Allâh we'll go into the Musnad or the definition of a Musnad Hadīth and then we'll go from there Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 3:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

Last week we finished talking about the Marfū' Hadīth as well as the Maqtū' Hadīth, so we talked about what is the definition of a Marfū' and what is the definition of a Maqtū', so we said the Maqtū' is what's to the Tābi'īn or anyone lower than that, and we mentioned the Mawqūf, not because it's part of this poem at this point, but just because the author skipped the Hadīth from the Sahābah, so he mentioned the Marfū' Hadīth which is to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and then he mentioned the Hadīth which is Maqtū' which is to the Tābi'īn or anyone below, but later on in the poem, he talks about the Mawqūf, so generally to make it easier, they would be mentioned together, so that's just the reason why i mentioned it, because it's tough to explain those 3 if you

skip the Sahābah or the narrations from the Sahābah, so that's where we ended on last week.

So next the author says:

وَ(الُمسْنَدُ) الُمتَّصِلُ الإسنادِ مِنْ ** رَاوِيهِ حتَّى الُمصْطفى ولْم يَبِنْ

Or he translates it as **"The tradition or the Hadīth that is supported..."**

So the musnad he translates it as supported,

"...its chain is indeed unbroken, intact from its last narrator to the one who has been chosen".

So here, he's mentioning or he's discussion the definition of the Musnad Hadīth, and he says that it's whatever has a connected chain from the last narrator, so meaning the collector of the Hadīth to the one whose chosen, so the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), al-Mustafah. So he's saying that the definition of the Musnad is anything that has a connected chain, so that's what the author says.

So just to comment a bit on this, the Musnad Hadīth as the author said it has a connected chain back to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so the conditions for it to be considered a Musnad Hadīth.

First that it has a Sanad.

Second, that the Sanad doesn't have anyone clearly missing from it, so meaning there's no one in the chain or there's no place in the chain that it says that someone isn't named or there's no clear emission from a person.

And lastly that it's Marfū', so that it's to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

So these are the conditions of the definition that the author chose for the definition of the Musnad. So this is generally the definition that's used, it was used by Imām al-Hākim(رحمه الله) in Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Hadīth and ibn Hajr al-'Asqlānī(رحمه الله) in al-Nukat and others.

So the widespread definition of Musnad is that it has a chain, the chain is at least outwardly connected, so meaning if there's a defect or if there's a break

in the chain, it isn't clear. And lastly that it's to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so it doesn't end at a Sahābī or it doesn't end at a Tābi'ī or anyone else.

However, there's some other definitions of what a Musnad Hadīth could be, so Imām ibn 'Abdûl Barr(رحمه الله) defined it that it's any Hadīth that's Marfū', so regardless of whether the chain is connected or not and regardless of whether it's authentic or not. Any Hadīth that is considered Marfū' or ends at the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is considered to be a Musnad Hadīth, and Imām al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله), he gave it a definition, that anything is that it's connected, so he said that:

"Anything that has a connected chain regardless of whether it's to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or whether it's to the Sahābah or the Tābi'īn, anything that has a connected chain would be considered a Musnad Hadīth",

And some scholars say that it's anything with a Sanad, so regardless of whether it's connected or not and regardless of whether it's to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) or anyone lower, anything with a Sanad or a chain of narration would be considered a Musnad Hadīth, but the first definition that we mentioned and the one that the author subscribes too, that's the main or the most well known definition and explanation of what a Musnad Hadīth is. And then just to add a few things here about when we talk about or when we mention a Hadīth, there are certain phrases that need to be used, they need to be kept in mind when we're mentioning Hadīth, so for e.g. if we're mentioning something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) that's authentic and we know that it's authentic, we have to say that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said or the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did or the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw or went or they saw him do this, we have to mention it with a phrasing that is clear that it actually took place, so we would say:

"Qāl Rāsūl-Allah(صلى الله عليه وسلم)" or **"Fa'ala Rasūl-Allâh(صلى الله عليه وسلم) Kathā"** or something like this.

Or we would say that if it's something that's weak, then we can't or we shouldn't say things like that, we should say it's attributed to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or it's in a weak Hadīth, it's said, it's come in a weak Hadīth that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, anytime we mention a weak Hadīth, we should clarify or we should give some sort of clarification as to what the Hadīth

is, so we can't just mention a Hadīth that we know is weak and say **"The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this"** because when we say he said it, then we're obviously attributing it to the Shar', so we can't knowingly say something that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something when we know he didn't say it or we can't confirm that he said it, so authentic Ahādīth need to be narrated or mentioned in a way that clearly explains that it's from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), weak Ahādīth need to be mentioned in a way that clearly shows that they're weak Ahādīth.

And the last thing is with Mawdū' Ahādīth or Ahādīth that we know are not from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), whether it's Mawdū' or if it's Munkar or anything like this, then they shouldn't be narrated or especially Mawdū' Hadīth shouldn't be narrated it at all, not even mentioned unless the point of it is to explain that it's Mawdū', so we shouldn't even really spread them amongst the people because they're useless really in the end. A weak Hadīth might be useful at some point, because if there's 2 or 3 or 4 of the same Hadīth that's weak, they might strengthen each other, so a weak Hadīth might have a benefit in and of itself at some point, but a Mawdū' Hadīth, we're saying that we know that this is a lie on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so there's no benefit whatsoever from it unless the point behind it is that we're only mentioning this Hadīth to you is because it's a Mawdū' Hadīth, so this just some things to keep in mind when we're talking about Ahādīth, often people don't differentiate between them and they just mention it all as if it's from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and they would only clarify that if you ask them, so if later on if you said, well what is the authenticity of this Hadīth, they would say **"Oh it's weak"** or **"Oh it's Munkar"** or **"Oh it's Mawdū'"** or something like that, but we're discussing the words of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and his actions which are from the Wahī so it can't be something that's taken lightly and we just narrate it in any way that we feel like narrating it as, so this is just a small thing about the Musnad, there's not really much to discuss on that topic.

Student: What is Munkar?

Shaykh: We'll talk about it, but it's when it's clarified that it's a mistake from a person, so meaning that either this is the only person who narrated it from someone despite the fact that that person might have 50 or 100 or 200 students, only 1 person narrates this thing, so generally we judge that this is a

mistake from the person, because where were all the other students who didn't hear this somehow, or it can be, it's more often that it's like what we talked about before about Shāth that if someone narrates it one way and then someone who is not as trustworthy or not as accurate narrates it a different way, then we would say the one that's less trustworthy, generally yeah, not every time, but that's what the definition would be or the explanation of it.

Next the author says:

وَمَا بِسَمْعِ كُلِّ رَاوٍ يَتَّصِلْ ** إِسْنَادُهُ للْمُصطَفى فَـ(الُمتَّصِلْ)

Or he says which translates as:

"Whatsoever is connected by the hearing of all who narrated through the one who has been chosen, the term is then connected"

So here he's talking about the Mutassil Hadīth, so just to talk about this, the Mutassil Hadīth is that each narrator heard it from the one who he narrated it from, so the chain is connected from the beginning to the end and so it's similar to the Musnad except that for ease of explanation to stick to these definitions, it would be different than the Musnad in the sense that it doesn't matter who it's too, it doesn't matter if it's to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or the Sahābī or the Tābi'ī as long as the chain itself is connected, then it would be connected Mutassil or it would be a connected chain. So this is the case with regards to whether it's Marfū' or Mawqūf or Maqtū', but if we just look at what the author mentioned, he didn't seem to differentiate between the musnad and the mutasil because here he said:

"whatever each narrator has heard from the other one to the Mustafa, then it's Mutassil"

So he also added the definition or the condition that the Mutassil needs to be to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so really it doesn't seem that he differentiated between the Musnad and the Mutassil because he gave them the same conditions, but generally ibn al-Salāh(رحمه الله) and others from the scholars of Hadīth when they defined it, they defined it as that it doesn't need to be to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), because all we're saying is that is this chain connected or not, and it can be connected regardless of who it's too, obviously

44

the highest would be to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but if it's connected to the Sahābī, we would still call it Mutassil because the chain is connected, so it fulfils that condition, so there's not really much to discuss about the Mutassil with regards to the definition.

Next the author says:

<div dir="rtl">

(مُسَلْسَلٌ) قُلْ مَا عَلَى وَصْفٍ أَتَى ** مِثْلُ أَمَا واللہ أَنْبَأَنِي الفَتَى

كذَاكَ قَدْ حَدَّثَنِيهِ قائِماً ** أَوْ بَعْدَ أَنْ حَدَّثَنِي تَبَسَّمَا

</div>

So they translate this as **"Linked (Musalsal)"** that's the type of Hadīth he's talking about, Musalsal.

"Linked is the tradition that does come with a story as in the saying, 'by Allâh it was the boy who did inform me', likewise he told me as he was standing or and after he told me he was smiling"

So this is now talking about a description or a characteristic which might be present in a chain of narration, so a better translation, it shouldn't say story, it should say description, so it should be:

"Any chain of narration that comes in a specific description throughout the whole chain or throughout most of the chain"

So it doesn't have to necessarily have to be a story, so this is a type of Hadīth or a type of topic that doesn't in and of itself relate to the authenticity, it has something more to do with how each person narrated it to the person after them, so sometimes it will be specific actions that the narrator did as he was narrating the Hadīth to the person who came after him, so for example the author mentioned that he did it while standing.

So for e.g. there might be a Hadīth where each person in the chain narrated it to the next person below while he was standing, so then that next person would then pass it down to the next one standing up and so on and so on throughout the whole chain, likewise there's some that where they're smile, so after they narrate the Hadīth they would smile, so then the next narrator, when he would pass on the Hadīth, he would smile after doing it and so on, so

45

the whole chain would have each person doing the same action. Likewise grabbing the beard, so sometimes they might hold their beard while they're doing it, so then that student would pass it on to his students later on with the same characteristic or the same action.

Student: So is it like the physical style in which the Hadīth is being narrated.

Shaykh: That's one of the possibilities, yep. So it might be that they did it while they were standing, they did it in a certain place. The point of it is that any specific characteristic is throughout the chain, so sometimes it's physical, other times it might be in the statement, so they might say: **"By Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) I love you so such and such"** and then they would pass it on, so every Shaykh would then pass it on to his student with that phrase. Sometimes it's in the phrase of narrating itself, so they would say **"So and so informed me"** and **"So and so informed me"** and **"So and so informed me"**, so they wouldn't say **"I heard so and so"**, the whole chain would be **"My Shaykh told me this"** or "**my Shaykh told me this"**, so they would have that specific way of narrating it. Other types of Musalsal or that they were all done in the Musallâh of the Eid, so the place where they pray the Eid, this Hadīth each time it was passed on, it was passed on in this specific area. Sometimes also every person in a chain might be named Muhammâd, so the characteristic that's present throughout the chain is the name of the person, and likewise sometimes it might be that everyone in the chain starting at a certain point was from Egypt, or everyone in the chain starting at some point was from Bilād al-Shām or from 'Irāq or something like that, so they would say this Hadīth is Musalsal bi-Shāmiyīn or Musalsal bil-Masriyīn or bil-Muhammâdīn, so every person in the chain is from Bilād al-Shām or from 'Irāq or everyone in the chain is named Muhammâd or something like that.

Student: But then who sets up that parameter or does it just happen to be?

Shaykh: It just happens to be that, so sometimes it would be because for example maybe a Sahābī moved to Bilād al-Shām, so his students were from there and then they passed it on and the person who eventually collected it was from there, so just happened to be that everyone in the chain was that. Other times for example still to today scholars of Hadīth would pass on to their students Ahādīth that's called **al-Musalsal bil-Awwäliyyäh** or that it's

connected with firstness, so what does that mean, so from every student in the chain, this is the first Hadīth that they heard from their Shaykh, so they'll say for e.g. my Shaykh so and so informed me and this is the first Hadīth that i heard from him that he said he heard it from his Shaykh so and so and this is the first Hadīth that he heard from him and so and so, all the way back till and up to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم). So say 1,300 or 1,200 years, this Hadīth has been the first Hadīth that every student has heard from their Shaykh up until today, so they're still passed on today.

So some of the benefits of this is that it might make it easier to memorise. So for example if they are only Muhammâd, then that makes at least the first name of every person in the chain if they've all said "**Hadathanî**" or "**I was informed by**" or **"I was told by"** makes it easier that no one in the chain said "**Akhbaranī**" which is another way of phrasing or "**Anba'anī**" or "**Qāla lī**" so it makes the memorisation of the phrasing of passing on Hadīth easier to memorise. Another benefit of it is sometimes it has a type of worship in it, so for e.g if they're saying **"By Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) I love you"** or **"I love you for the sake of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى)"** or something like that, then each time they pass this on they're performing an act of worship in narrating this Hadīth as well. And lastly it's just from the traditions of the scholars of Hadīth, so for e.g. if nowadays you collect a Hadīth from your Shaykh and he collected from his and he collected it from his so on all the way back and it was done in a specific manner, then it's part of the tradition that you're taking part in the way the Muhaddîthīn would pass on their Ahādīth to their students so it's just something that you're taking part in this tradition that stretches back over a thousand years, so these are just some of the benefits of the Musalsal.

And next the author says, he goes onto another type, he says:

<div dir="rtl">

(عَزِيزٌ) مَرْوِيٌّ اثْنَيْنِ أَوْ ثَلاثَهْ ** (مَشْهورٌ) مَرْوِيٌّ فَوْقَ ما ثَلاثَهْ

</div>

So it translates as:

"Strengthened is the narration related by 2 or 3, popular is the one related by more than 3"

So here he's going into the definitions of different types of Ahādīth that relate to how many people narrated the Hadīth so it's not the discussing the authenticity per say but it's discussing the number of narrators at any given level in the chain of narration, so first he describes 'Azīz, so he says 'Azīz here is translated as strengthened and this is the best explanation of it, so meaning that the Hadīth it's a strengthened Hadīth so this goes back to the definition linguistically of 'Azīz when Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

$$ إِذْ أَرْسَلْنَا إِلَيْهِمُ اثْنَيْنِ فَكَذَّبُوهُمَا فَعَزَّزْنَا بِثَالِثٍ فَقَالُوا إِنَّا إِلَيْكُم مُّرْسَلُونَ $$

Or that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) when he was discussing that he sent two Prophets to a specific people he said:

"When we sent to them 2 messengers, they belied them both, so we reinforced them or strengthened them with a third" so this is <u>Azazna</u>.

'Azīz can mean strengthened linguistically so what they say is that if a Hadīth has only 1 person, the likelihood of it being weak is more likely, but if there's 2 people narrating the Hadīth, then now it's being strengthened by a second person narrating the Hadīth, so they say the 'Azīz is a Hadīth that is narrate by 2. Another explanation of why it's called 'Azīz because 'Azīz can also mean rare, so they say that it's rare that you find a Hadīth that only 2 people narrated, the likelihood of it being more than 2 or the likelihood of it being 1 is more likely, but this is a weak explanation of why because in reality there are many Hadīth that at one place in the chain, there would be only 2 narrators narrating the Hadīth. So this is what the 'Azīz is, so what that would mean, it doesn't mean that each person in the chain or each level of the chain needs to have 2 people, what it means is that at 1 point, there's only 2 people in the chain.

So for e.g. it would be say that The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something, then 2 Sahābah narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then 3 people narrated it from each companion, and then 3 people from each of those and so on and so on, so we have after the Sahābah, we have 3 people narrating this Hadīth from each narrator, but because in the beginning there was only 2 narrators of the Hadīth, this would be considered 'Azīz because it goes back to

the **lowest level of the chain** is what we take what type of Hadīth it is. So if at one point there's only 2 narrators in the chain, then that's what we go by.

Student: So 'Azīz is only 2?

Shaykh: At one point in the Sanad there's only 2 narrators.

And likewise it would be say there's 4 Sahābah narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then 3 from each of those, then 2 from each of those, it would still be considered 'Azīz because at some point, there's only 2 narrators narrating this Hadīth at some point, so regardless of whether, say at some point it gets to 70 people narrating it, we go by what is the constant that's in each part of the chain, so it never dropped below 2, we go by the 2.

And then the same thing we would say when it comes to Mash-hūr, so Mash-hūr translates as famous, and the author I don't know what he translates it as, "Popular" so a general meaning, so if there's 3 then it would be considered "**Mash-hūr**", so it would be the same thing, so if one companion narrated it or say and then 3 after that from every level, we wouldn't consider it Mash-hūr because only 1 companion narrated it, so what we would say for Mash-hūr is that, and every level in the Sanad, there's at least 3 people, if it drops below 3 then it would be no longer considered Mash-hūr.

So here the point of knowing this is because often there might be a weak narrator somewhere in the chain but if there's another person who is at that level who isn't weak, then he obviously takes the place of that narrator and the weakness of that one wouldn't affect it, or say that it was Mash-hūr so there's 3 narrators but each one of them is weak, if we said well each one of them has a slight weakness, they might strengthen each other, so it's important to know how many people narrated it at each level, because when it comes to strengthening a Hadīth or not, but if it's for example an 'Azīz Hadīth, that means there's only 2, then if there's a weakness in the chain, it's less likely to be strengthened just because there's less people to actually strengthen it, doesn't mean it won't strengthen it, but for example 2 weak people is less likely to strengthen than 7 weak people obviously, if 7 weak people narrate a Hadīth and they all have a slight weakness, that's better than 2 weak people narrating a Hadīth, 2 of them having a slight weakness because the more

information we have, the more we're informed about a matter even if the people are weak, the stronger it would be.

So just to point out something here, the way the author phrases it, it seems a little bit unclear because he says that the 'Azīz is something that's narrated by 2 or 3, and then he says Mash-hūr is whatever is more than 3, generally according to most if not all the other scholars of Hadīth, when they discuss this they say that 2 is considered 'Azīz, 3 or more is considered Mash-hūr, unless it reaches the level of Mutawātir which is something we'll get into later on, so if there's only 1 narrator, then they call it Gharīb or Fard, generally they use Gharīb, but sometimes the word Fard would be used as well, so meaning that it's strange or something that's not well known because if only 1 narrator narrates it, then it's not obviously as wide-spread, and again, each one of these things in and of itself doesn't prove authenticity because if we just talk about logic, we would say something is narrated by 3 people is stronger than something narrated by 1, but for example the well known Hadīth:

<div dir="rtl">

إنما الأعمال بالنيات

</div>

It's considered a Gharīb Hadīth because 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه) is the only one who narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from 'Omar(رضي الله عنه), and only 1 from the Atbā' al-Tābi'īn narrated it from the Tābi'ī so it didn't get passed being a single narration until much later on in the chain but we know that it's an authentic Hadīth. Other times a Hadīth might be considered Mash-hūr in the sense that it has 3 narrators in every level of the chain but it's still considered weak, so in and of itself it doesn't prove authenticity but in the end it would be something that could relate to authenticity because for example if a scholar has 500 narrators that narrate from him and only 1 narrates something from him, it's very likely that that's a mistake so the fact that only 1 narrator narrated it did affect the authenticity, but at the same time we know that there are Ahādīth that are at the height of authenticity that do only have 1 narrator at 1 or 2 or 3 levels of the Sanad, so in and of itself it doesn't always relate to authenticity, and then just a last point to talk about is Mash-hūr which is considered 3 or more narrators, sometimes the scholars call it "**Mustafīdh**" so you might hear that phrase used instead so meaning that it's in the end the same definition, so if

you ever come across the word Mustafīdh, generally it's the same definition as Mash-hūr, and then next the author goes into discussing Mu'an'an Hadīth but Inshā'Allâh we'll stop there for today and Thursday we'll continue with that, Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 4:

إِنَّ الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

Inshā'Allâh today we'll start with where the author says:

(مَعَنْعَنٌ) كَعَن سَعِيدٍ عَنْ كَرَمْ * * (وَمُبهَمٌ) مَا فيهِ رَاوٍ لْم يُسَمْ

Or which translates as:

"Like from Sa'īd from Karam, the Mu'an'an is proclaimed, the obscure contains a person who has not been named"

So again like we said that the translator tries to keep it in poetic form, so the first type of Hadīth that we're talking about is what's called a **Mu'an'an** Hadīth, so what this means is that the narrator narrates from his Shaykh with the phrase **'An** so we didn't get into it too much so far but the phrasings of narration or the **Sīgh al-Riwāyah**, there's a number of different ones, so it can be **Haddathanī** or **Akhbaranī** or **Anba'anī** or **'An** or **An** or **Qāla**, so it can be **"I was informed"** or **"It was narrated to me"** or **"someone said"** or it can be **"from"** or **"that"**, so these are the different types of phrasings that the narrators will use when they're narrating a Hadīth from their Shaykh.

So for e.g. with the word **'an**, it doesn't necessarily indicate that the person met that person or that they heard from this person, so for e.g. If I say, **"Khalid said to me"** unless I'm a liar, it's clear that I met him obviously and he told me

this thing, if i say **"From Khalid that he said this"**, could be that I met him and I heard it from him, could be that I met him but I didn't hear it from him, it could be that we didn't even live in the same time, I'm just mentioning something from Khalid, so this is what this is, so the **Mu'an'an**, it's from **"'an"** or from the word **"from"**, so this is the type of Hadīth that we're talking about here, so a Hadīth that's narrated with the phrasing **'an**, it can be a number of different categories, or it can have a number of different situations.

The first is that the person who uses that phrasing is considered a trustworthy narrator and he isn't considered a Mudallâs, and a Mudallîs, we'll get into it very soon, but it's someone who cheats in the way they narrate things, so they will narrate something from someone that they didn't hear from them, but they'll do it in a way that indicates that they might've heard from them or they might've not heard from them, so if the narrator who uses the phrase **'an** or "**from**" when he's speaking about who he heard from, if he isn't known for being a Mudallîs, so he isn't someone who cheats in the way he narrates a Hadīth, then there's no problem in him using the word "**from**", it doesn't affect the authenticity of the narration whatsoever because we're saying that this person is a trustworthy narrator, he doesn't have this problem with cheating in the way he narrates so when he says "**from**" we accept it at face value that he's narrating something that he heard from his Shaykh. Just some examples of that is like Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) will sometimes use the word **'an** when he narrates, Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) will use the same thing, these people they're Imāms of Hadīth, they're trustworthy, they aren't known for using this type of cheating phrase or cheating on who they narrate from, so there's no problem that we accept or if we hear them saying **'an** it doesn't affect the authenticity of the chain of narration.

The second type could be if the narrator is accused of some sort of **Tadlīs** or some sort of cheating in the way they narrate, so then we have to look at well what type of narrator is this with regards to his cheating, if he's someone who is very rare from him that he does it, that it's only once or twice that he would do something like that, then we accept the narration with the phrase of **'an** at face value that he heard from him, until we have evidence otherwise, so we say okay, this person, yes, sometimes he would cheat with who he narrated from or he would narrate something in a way that he shouldn't have but

because the vast majority of the time, he doesn't do this and he's considered trustworthy then we accept him at his word until we have evidence to the contrary. And this was discussed by Imām ibn Hajr al-'Asqalānī(رحمه الله) in his book **"Ta'ārīf Ahlal Tadlīs"** so he has a whole book just talking about this topic, so he talked about that.

The second is that it might not be rare, but it's a very small amount of Tadlīs, and likewise we would also overlook this, say for example, they narrated over 100 Hadīth, say 10 of them have Tadlīs in them, we would overlook this as well, because it's a very small amount with regards to how many Ahādīth they've narrated, so we have **Husn al-Dhan** or we hold them with a good assumption that they're not cheating until we have it proven otherwise. The third type would be if this person very often performs the Tadlīs, so it's more often than not that he would narrate from someone and say **"From so and so"** when he didn't actually hear it from him, in this case, this 3rd situation, we would reject this person's narration until we have evidence that he actually heard it, so if someone who for example is known for using lie a cheating phrase, if they say **"I heard from so and so"** then we accept it, because now they're openly saying that they heard so unless we consider him a liar we should accept him based upon what he's saying, but if he doesn't say that he heard it, or he saw it, or he doesn't give some sort of indication that he directly took it from his Shaykh, then we don't accept it from him.

The last type is that the narrator is considered a **Mudallîs**, so he cheats and he's actually a weak narrator, so in this situation, we would if he uses **'an'ana** or he uses the word **"From"** then we wouldn't accept it because he's a Mudallîs, and even if he said that he heard it from his Shaykh, then we wouldn't even accept it then, or we would declare the chain to be weak, because this is a weak narrator, so he would have double the amount of problems or he would have the Tadlīs plus the fact that he's a weak narrator and we'll get into this a little bit more later on, this is just an introduction to the topic, so just to I guess some it up, in and of itself, if a narrator says **"From so and so, from so and so"** it doesn't affect the chain in and of itself, the only time it would is if the person who's using this phrasing is known for using it as a way to cheat and attribute that they've heard it from a Shaykh.

So this is the first half of the poetry that the author mentioned, the second is he's talking now about the mubham, so a mubham is when someone in the chain is unnamed, so if the narrator says: **"So and so told me"** so here we don't know who this person is, then this would be considered a weakness in the chain, so for e.g. if Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah(رحمه الله) narrates a Hadīth from a Shaykh from Muhammad ibn Fulān. So here we have Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah (رحمه الله) who we know from a Shaykh, we don't know who this person is, from Muhammad ibn Fulān, so now we know the first person and the third person, but there's someone in between who is unnamed, so we have no way of knowing necessarily who this person is, it could be a trustworthy person but they could also be a weak person, they could even be a liar, and because there's this lack of knowledge about who this narrator is, we can't judge on the Hadīth, and what do we hold as being the basis with regards to Ahādīth? If someone tells us a Hadīth, do we hold it as being authentic until it's proven otherwise, do we reject it until it's proven? [Student Answers]: Rejected until proven otherwise. [Shaykh Continues]: Exactly, so we don't accept anything, well not necessarily, I phrased it wrong, maybe it's better not to say that we reject it. But we don't accept it until it's proven, so if we have a Hadīth, could be a Hadīth, it couldn't be a Hadīth, but it's safer to say we're not going to attribute it to the Sharī'ah until it's proven then to say everything's from the Sharī'ah until we prove it otherwise, because it would make it impossible to weed out everything that isn't from the Sharī'ah because all someone would have to do is come and bring something and make something up, and then we have to find out, okay it's now our job to prove how this isn't from the Sharī'ah, it's actually the opposite.

If something is from the Sharī'ah, you have to prove it, it's not on the Muslimīn to disprove everything from being from the Sharī'ah, so this is the Mubham, the only exception to this and I think we talked about this before in the fiqh classes, was that if the Mubham person is from the Sahābah, what's the ruling on that? So say a Tābi'ī said **"That I heard someone from the companions of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) say that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this"** [Student Answers]: We would take that Hadīth because all of them [i.e. Sahābah] are trustworthy. [Shaykh Continues]: Exactly, so if we know that this person is from the companions, it doesn't matter to us whether we know his name or not, because Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) judged upon the Sahābah in the

Qur'ān that they were all upon good, and we know that it would be impossible for the Sahābah to narrate something attributing it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) if they weren't sure that it was from him, so if they had heard something but were unsure of the phrasing, it would be impossible for them to attribute it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) without being sure, because even nowadays a practising muslim would find it almost impossible to say "**The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this**" and they don't know if he said it or not, so how about the Sahābah when we know that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) judged upon them that they were just and that they were upon goodness, so this is the only exception to someone remaining unnamed in the chain, the only exception is if we know that the person is from the Sahābah, then it wouldn't matter to us whether we knew his name or not. Another thing to mention under this topic is often you'll find a narrator say "**I was informed by a trustworthy person that so and so said this, that so and so said this**", so he won't name the person, but he's say "**Someone who's trustworthy narrated this Hadīth to me**", in this situation, even though this person has said that this person who narrated it to me is considered trustworthy, we don't accept the Hadīth and the reason for that is this person who narrated it from him might consider him trustworthy, but there might be 10 other people out there who know about this person that he's not a trustworthy person, so just to bring it closer to home, for e.g. there's someone in the masjid who I think is trustworthy and I come and tell you guys, "**someone trustworthy told me this**", you might know this guy personally for longer than I have and you might have a better idea about this person, so if I told you his name, you might say "**No no, that guy is not trustworthy. He said this and this and this, and he's a liar or he has a bad memory or whatever**", so just because I consider him trustworthy, it doesn't mean that the chain is authentic, because there might be more people out there who know that this person is not trustworthy, so in and of itself, we can't accept it as being an authentic Hadīth even though this narrator is mentioning that this narrator is trustworthy that he took it from.

The next thing, it is kinda related to this topic is what they call a Muhmal narrator, so meaning that he's left in a sense that not necessarily his name is not left out, but he's left anonymous kind of thing, or he's left in a way that it's not possible to know who he is, so for e.g. if he says "**Muhammad narrated to me**", for e.g. maybe he's narrated from 30 people named Muhammad, instead

of saying Muhammad ibn so and so or Muhammad from this place, he just says "**Muhammad narrated to me**", in this situation it's possible that it would be considered weakness because we don't know who this person is, the only time it wouldn't be considered a weakness is if for e.g. say he only had 1 shaykh named Muhammad and he says Muhammad, then there's no reason for us to think that it would be anyone else because all of the Ahādīth that he narrated from someone named Muhammad was this one person so there's at that point, generally we would accept it, but the point is or if you take the take away points for this is that we need to know the narrators in the chain in order to judge upon it, so if the person is left out completely, by skipping him or he's mentioned as "**so and so told me**" or if he's mentioned as "**Someone trustworthy told me**" or even if the person says his name but it's not clear which of these narrators with that name it is, at that point we would withhold judgement or we wouldn't judge upon a Hadīth as being authentic because we can't at this point.

And this lack of narrating or lack of mentioning the person's name or not knowing who he is, it leads to something that is called Jahālah, so Jahālah is like ignorance of a person, or ignorance of the narrator, so often you'll find a Muhaddîth, maybe will look at a chain and say "**This Hadīth is weak because so and so is Majhūl(unknown)**", so we're not saying that the person is weak, we're not calling him a liar, we're not saying he has a bad memory, we're not necessarily making any accusation against this narrator himself, but we're saying he's unknown, so the fact that he's unknown we can't judge upon the Hadīth as being authentic, so we judge that it's weak until proven otherwise. And Jahālah or this ignorance of a narrator is 2 types:

The first, we call it Majhūl al-'Ayn and this would be when only 1 narrator has narrated from this person, so we don't know his condition and only 1 person has ever narrated from him.

The second type is we call Majhūl al-Hāl, so the first Majhūl al-'Ayn means he's unknown as an individual or he himself as a person is unknown. The second type which is Majhūl al-Hāl is what we translate as "**His condition is unknown**" so the definition of Majhūl al-Hāl is that two or more narrators have narrated from him, but no one has ever declared him to be trustworthy, so we don't have anyone saying he's weak, and we have two or more people narrating

from him, but we also don't have anyone saying he's a trustworthy narrator, so at this point, we have some information about him, but we don't have enough in order to judge upon his character or his condition as being a trustworthy narrator, and again this is just a very basic introduction to the issue of Jahālah or the issue of ignorance of a narrator, but like I said before, this is a more to have an understanding of the terminology of Hadīth, so then we can move on in our studies.

So next the author says:

<div dir="rtl">

وكُلُّ مَا قَلَّت رِجَالُهُ (عَلا) ** وضِدُّهُ ذَاكَ الذِي قَدْ (نَزَلا)

</div>

Which the translator translates that as

"Those whose men are few are indeed uplifted opposed to the ones which are deemed descended",

So here he's moving onto an issue which relates to the Isnād or the chain of narration, which is called "'Ulûw al-Sanad" or "Nuzūl al-Sanad", so he's talking about the highness or the lowness of the Sanad, so what this means is that the shorter a Sanad is, the higher it's considered. The longer a Sanad is, the lower it's considered and the reason for that is because if someone narrates something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and there's only 3 people between him and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), the likelihood of a weakness being in it is less than for e.g. if someone narrates something and there's 7 people between him and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so the shorter the Sanad, the better in and of itself, but it doesn't always prove that it's authentic, but if we have an authentic Hadīth that's considered a high Sanad, and an authentic Hadīth that's considered a low Sanad, obviously the high Sanad would be considered better because there's less people between the narrator and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

But again, just having a short Sanad doesn't mean it's authentic, so for e.g. if you have a chain where there's only 2 people between the narrator and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it can still be weak, because we know, and even in the time of the Tābi'īn who were the generation after the Sahābah, there were liars in that time, so if someone narrated from that person from the Sahābī

from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), there's only 2 people between the narrator and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but this can be an extremely weak Hadīth, as opposed to someone for e.g. down the line like al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) if he has 6 people between him and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), sure there's more than double the amount of people in the chain, but it's at the height of authenticity because these narrators are all trustworthy.

So for example, just to give an example of the high and low sanad, there's a narration from 'Abd ibn Humayd(رحمه الله) that he narrated from Yazīd ibn Hārūn(رحمه الله) from Humayd al-Tawīl(رحمه الله) from Anas(رضي الله عنه) from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so this Hadīth has 'Abd ibn Humayd(رحمه الله), he's the first one, so he's the one who collected the Hadīth, then he narrated it from Yazīd ibn Hārūn(رحمه الله) who narrated from Humayd al-Tawīl(رحمه الله) from Anas(رضي الله عنه) from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so there's 4 people up to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) also narrated the same Hadīth with the same chain of narration, the only difference is that he took it from 'Abd ibn Humayd(رحمه الله), so now it's Muslim(رحمه الله) > 'Abd ibn Humayd(رحمه الله) > Yāzīd ibn Hārūn (رحمه الله) > Humayd al-Tawīl(رحمه الله) > Anas ibn Mālik(رضي الله عنه), so there's 5 people in the chain now, they're both authentic, both chains are authentic, but obviously 'Abd ibn Humayd(رحمه الله) has 1 less person between him and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) than Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) did when he collected the Hadīth, so that's just a short example to show that they're both authentic, they're both at the height of authenticity, but one is a little bit stronger just because there's 1 less person between the narrator and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

And then there's another thing which I don't want to get into too much detail but they call it **al-'Ulûw al-Mutlaq** and **al-'Ulûw al-Nisbī**, which is **"Absolute Highness"** and **"Relative highness"** for example you might say that it's a high chain related to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so there's less people between this narrator and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), if we say it's al-'Ulûw al-Nisbī or it's relative highness then it would relate to a specific Imām, so you might say for example, between this narrator narrated a Hadīth, between him and Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) there's 3 people, another narrator narrated the same Hadīth between him and Imām Mālik(رحمه الله), there's 5 narrators, sometimes they

describe this highness and lowness not in relation to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), but in relation to a specific Imām in the chain of narration, but again that's a lot less important because it's not related to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), is there any questions so far?

Student: Where does Imām Abū Hanīfah(رحمه الله) fall into these categories?

Shaykh: Imām Abū Hanīfah(رحمه الله) with regards to Ahādīth, he was considered a weak narrator. So in Fiqh, obviously he's an Imām in Fiqh, but he had a very small number of Ahādīth and the scholars of Hadīth of the past would consider him to be like a weak narrator. And again he didn't actually have a book, some attribute a book to him called Musnad Abī Hanīfah, but it's not actually his book. Later on, people collected all of the Ahādīth that he himself was in the chain, or he narrated himself and then attributed it to him, but it's not actually from him, as opposed to Imām Mālik(رحمه الله), obviously he's from the Imāms of Hadīth. Al-Shāfi'ī(رحمه الله), not necessarily an Imām of Hadīth, but he was considered obviously a trustworthy narrator of Hadīth, and then Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) who's one of the top Imāms of Hadīth in history.

Student: Is all of Imām Ahmad's Hadīth authentic?

Shaykh: No, he'll collect a lot of Ahādīth that are weak, but they're not weak because of him, so it was because who he narrated it from, but if someone say narrates a Hadīth and Imām Ahmad's in the chain, it's not weak because of him, he's considered a trustworthy narrator.

So next the author says:

وَمَا أَضَفْتَهُ إِلَى الأَصْحَابِ مِنْ * * قَوْلٍ وفِعْلٍ فهْوَ (مَوْقُوفٌ) زُكِنْ

So here he's talking about the Mawqūf narration, and last Tuesday we got in a little bit about the Mawqūf so we said if it's narrated to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), what type of Hadīth would this be called? **Marfū'**. If it's narrated to a Tābi'ī or anyone lower, what would the definition or title be for that? **Maqtū'**. So here I just mentioned a bit about the Mawqūf on Tuesday just because it was left out of that part of the poem, but the Mawqūf is something:

Sometimes you'll see it being attributed, so they're say it's Mawqūf upon al-Hassan(رحمه الله), meaning al-Hassan al-Basrī(رحمه الله), or this is Mawqūf on Muhammad ibn Sīrīn(رحمه الله) or someone from the Tābi'īn, generally anytime we say Mawqūf, it relates to the Sahābah unless it's otherwise specified, so any time you see someone mention the word Mawqūf, then we understand it as being by default that it's a statement or an action of one of the companions. And some of the examples of this is a narration from Nāfi'(رحمه الله) from 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه):

أنه كان يصلي بالليل ركعتين وبالنهار أربعاً

Or Imām al-Tahāwī(رحمه الله) narrated from Nāfi'(رحمه الله) from ibn 'Omar (رضي الله عنه) **that he used to pray 2 Rak'ahs at night, so meaning he used to pray 2 by 2 at night, and he would pray 4 during the day**, so he would pray 4 by 4 during the day, so this is an example of an action of a Sahābah or one of the Sahābah.

And the statements of the Sahābah can be a number of types, so first of all they can be something that is related to the Ghayb, so it's related to the unseen, so whether it's something related to Jannâh and Nār, something related to the Malā'ikah, something related to Yawm al-Qiyāmah or just something that's unseen or unknown to the people. And if this is the case, so if a Sahābī narrates something that's considered from the ghayb, then we have to look at it, we say is this Sahābī known for taking narrations from Ahläl Kitāb or narrating from their books or discussing matters from their books. If he is, then some of the scholars say that we reject it, but if he's not known for taking matters from Ahläl Kitāb, then we would accept it, and we would say if a Sahābī says something related to the ghayb, then we attribute it in the end, or we say that it has the same ruling as if the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said, obviously not because the Sahābah know the ghayb or that they see the Wahī, it has nothing to do with that, it has to do with the fact that it's impossible like

we talked about before that a Sahābī would attribute something as being from the Ghayb if he didn't know for sure that it was from the ghayb, and the only way to know for sure that it is from the ghayb would be if they heard it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

And I'll just finish up on this and then we'll stop, we can also look at it, the statements of the Sahābah being divided differently, so first type would be:

If a Sahābī says something that contradicts the Qur'ān or the Sunnâh or the consensus or the Ijmā' then obviously we know that it's wrong because we don't accept the words of anybody, even if it's a Sahābī if it goes against the Qur'ān or the Sunnâh.

The second type would be that it contradicts the statement of another Sahābī, so we have 2 Sahābi's saying something that contradict each other, if this is the situation, then we know for a fact that one of them is correct but one of them is wrong and we have to then look, who has the stronger evidence, so we say it's not allowed for us to then bring another opinion because if the Sahābah divided on 2 opinions, then we know that the truth is with 1 of them, so we can't come and bring a 3rd opinion because if we know the truth is with 1 of these 2, us bringing a 3rd, well we already know it's wrong because even one of them was wrong, only 1 was correct. And then there's a dispute about what if the Sahābah are from the Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, as opposed to the Sahābah that weren't, and then if they're from the Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, are they Abū Bakr(رضي الله عنه) and (رضي الله عنه) or are they 'Uthmān(رضي الله عنه) and 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) 'Alī(رضي اله عنه) and so on, which again I won't go into because it's more to do with Usūl al-fiqh and less to do with the terminology of Hadīth. So in the end we can see that the statements of the Sahābah depending how we divide it, sometimes it can be considered a proof, and sometimes it won't be considered a proof, and sometimes it's accepted as being part of the Dīn because we're attributing it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) and sometimes it's not, so Inshā'Allâh we'll stop there, next time the author goes into the definition of a Mursal narration, and then we'll go into that, Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 5:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

Inshā'Allâh we're continuing still with al-Bayqūniyyâh or the poem of al-Bayqūnī, the last thing that we talked about i think was the Mawqūf of the Sahābah, so the next thing that the author mentions, he says:

(وَمُرْسِلٌ) مِنهُ الصَّحَابِّي سَقَطْ ** وقُلْ (غَريبٌ) ما رَوَى رَاوٍ فَقَطْ

Or which translates as **"Sent is the tradition, the companion is omitted, and say strange is the one that only 1 related"**,

So the first thing that he's talking about is the Mursal, so he translates it as sent, so you can translate it as sent or forwarded, so meaning that one person forwarded it to someone else that they didn't directly narrate from, so there's someone missing, here the author defines it as being that the companion is omitted, and we'll talk about that right away.

So the first thing is that the Mursal, this definition of Mursal appears to be correct except that it just needs a bit of explanation. So if what the author meant when he says that the Tābi'ī or that the Sahābī is missing, if he what he means by this is that the Tābi'ī so meaning the generation after the Sahābah, if this Tābi'ī narrates it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), if this is what he means, then this is a correct definition. If the author means that the Sahābī isn't mentioned and that's the problem with the narration or that's what makes it Mursal, then this isn't a correct ruling, and the reason for this is because the Sahābī not being named, we talked about this a little bit before, it doesn't affect a chain, so if a person from the Tābi'īn says I heard it from a companion of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then this isn't considered a defect, so with every other generation, we need to know the name of the person, and the condition of the person who is being narrated from except for the Sahābah

because there's a consensus that they're all considered trustworthy and that them not being known individually doesn't affect the chain of narration, and no one really disputed this except Imām ibn Hazm(رحمه الله), but he's not considered form the scholars of Hadīth, so really his dispute doesn't affect it, plus he's from a later generation, also Imām al-Bayhaqī(رحمه الله), there's some narrations from him or some instances from him where he would dispute something that a Sahābī wasn't narrated in, but other instances he would accept them, and a number of scholars have said that it appears that the reason for this is because Imām al-Bayhaqī(رحمه الله) was Shāfi'ī in Madhab, so sometimes when it came to a Hadīth possibly contradicting something from the Madhab of Imām al-Shāfi'ī(رحمه الله), he would use the absence of the Sahābī in the chain or the ignorance of the Sahābī's name, where he would use it sometimes as a defect, and sometimes he wouldn't.

So really not many people disputed this, except for a few and they were from later generations and some of them weren't even Muhaddîthīn, so really in the end, this doesn't affect the authenticity of a Hadīth, so really the better definition of what a Mursal narration is, is something in which a Tābi'ī narrates from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so a Tābi'ī says "**The Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this**" or "**The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) did this**", so the defect here isn't that the companion is missing from the chain, the defect is that we don't know who is between this Tābi'ī and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), he could've got it from a companion of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), that's possible, but it's also possible that he narrated it from another Tābi'ī from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), or from 2 Tābi'īn from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and we know that although all of the Sahābah were considered trustworthy, the Tābi'īn weren't like that, some of them were weak in their memory and some of them fell into Bid'ah and some of them were even considered outright liars, so we can't say that we make a good assumption that the person he narrated it from was considered trustworthy. So someone might say, well what is the problem, what's the likelihood that a Tābi'ī didn't narrate it from a Sahābī, because if we know that generally each student would take it from their Shaykh and they would take it from the person above them, so if the Tābi'īn is the generation after the Sahābah and the Sahābah are the companions of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then what's the likelihood that it didn't go directly in this chain. If we look to a Hadīth that have been narrated, there's some narrations where it's 2,

some where it's 3, up to where we might have in 1 chain, 6 Tābi'īn, so from the same actual generation that they narrated it from each other, then to the Sahābah, then to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

An example of this is Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) narrated a Hadīth from 'Abdûl Rahmān ibn Mahdī(رحمه الله) from Zā'idah ibn Qudāmah(رحمه الله), so these were from the Atbā' al-Tābi'īn and then the generation after them, but then from the Tābi'īn, we have 6 people, so Zā'idah(رحمه الله) narrated it from Mansūr(رحمه الله) who's a Tābi'ī from Hilāl ibn Yassāf(رحمه الله), who's a Tābi'ī, from al-Rabī' ibn Khuthaym(رحمه الله), from 'Abdûl Rahmān ibn Maymūn(رحمه الله), who's a Tābi'ī, from 'Abdûl Rahmān ibn Abī Laylâ(رحمه الله) who's a Tābi'ī, from a woman from the Ansār from Abū Ayyūb al-Ansārī(رضي الله عنه), so we have 6 people in this chain who are actually from the Tābi'īn, so if we were to say that it's likely that the Tābi'īn narrated it from the Sahābī so we're going to accept it, we have a possibility of a chain like this where there's actually 6 people in between the first Tābi'ī and the companion, so we can't just say oh it's because it's from a Tābi'ī, we're going to accept it because they narrate it from the Sahābah, we don't know how many people are actually between that Tābi'ī and the companion, so this is the definition of a Mursal, and what it actually means and just to show you why it's considered a defect, so because of this definition, the scholars differed in what is the authenticity of a Mursal narration, so if a Tābi'ī says that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something or the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) did something, now what is the authenticity of this statement, so there's a difference of opinion.

One opinion is that they're all accepted, so any time a Tābi'ī says that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something or the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) did something, then it would be considered accepted and this wouldn't be considered a defect, based upon what we know, what do you guys think about this opinion? [Student]: It's pretty weak. [Shaykh] Yeah it can't be, it has to be because we don't know who is in-between, we don't know how many so how can we just outright say that every Mursal would be considered authentic.

Another opinion is that none of them are accepted, so they say because this is a defect then we reject it, so if we reject it because of this, then all of them are considered weak.

A third opinion is that the Mursal narrations from Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyîb (رحمه الله) are considered authentic, but every other one is considered weak, the reason for this is they say that if we look to all the narrations of Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyîb(رحمه الله) in which he narrated Mursal narrations, if we look we can find them elsewhere that he narrated them from a Sahābī, so they say that in reality we know that he never narrated it except from the Sahābah (رضي الله عنهم).

And the last opinion is that they say that if it's known that this Tābi'ī only narrated from trustworthy people, then we would accept his Mursal narrations, and if it's not known then we would say that we can't accept it.

So Allâhu a'lam in the end though, if we look at Mursal as a definition and what this means, so meaning that a Tābi'ī narrated to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), the strongest opinion in the end seems to be that in and of itself every mursal narration as it stands would be considered weak. If we look and find it elsewhere that this Tābi'ī narrated it from a Sahābī in another narration of the Hadīth, so we have that gap that it's bridged, then we would say that it's authentic, but not because we accept the mursal narrations, it would be because we've actually found who this person was missing in the chain, so really in the end, since it's a break in the chain we don't know who this person is then we have to judge that this is a weak narration, so anytime we find that it's a mursal narration, then we should state that it's considered weak until we find something to strengthen it, so for e.g. if we find something in which the companion is mentioned directly from that Tābi'ī to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), then we would accept it, if we find some other factor that would strengthen it, then we would accept it, but we would say that it's being strengthened or it's accepted now not because we accept mursal narration, but it has to do more with the fact that the Irsāl or that state of being mursal is now being cancelled out, because we found it elsewhere.

Student: That's in terms of if we were to find the name of the person who narrated it, but what if we do find someone else, like a different source saying the same thing, like the same message which is being delivered, but by a different source, but we are not able to find the name of the person, but the message is still the same?

Shaykh: Sometimes it gets strengthened, so if you looked at it and said for example who did these people narrate from, maybe these 2 Tābi'īn only narrate from one Sahābī, so then we found 2 people who only narrate from one Sahābī, who have narrated the same thing but didn't mention the Sahābī. At this point, you might say, well the likelihood of this being that they heard it from not the Sahābī's unlikely, so we would consider this to be like Hassan, so we wouldn't consider it authentic in and of itself, but it strengthens it to a point where it might be acceptable.

Student: But we would not consider this as non-mursal, we would still consider it as mursal.

Shaykh: Right, but we might then say they strengthen each other though.

So this is just a basic introduction I guess as well to what a mursal narration is and why it's considered a weak narration and just a point to mention on this is that often we'll find mursal narrations from al-Hassan(رحمه الله) and 'Attā'(رحمه الله), they mention mursal narrations very often, so they'll say that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, so the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) did this, these 2 Tābi'īn, their mursal narrations are considered to be at the lowest level of mursal, and the reason for that is Imām Ahmad, he said that because they'll take from anyone, anyone they hear from, they'll narrate from them. They didn't differentiate; they didn't try to weed out weak narrators from trustworthy narrators, or weak narrations from authentic narrations. Anything they heard that was attributed to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), they would narrate it, so this shows that even mursal narrations, even if they're considered weak, they can be at different levels, so if we know that for example we don't have anything from this Tābi'ī that he ever narrated it from another Tābi'ī, then his would be alot higher than someone who's known for often narrating from Tābi'īn, because the likelihood of it being weak from this person is alot more now than it would be for the second person. We don't again put everything at the same level.

So this is about the mursal narration, next thing that the author mentioned in that same verse of poetry, he mentioned the Gharīb Hadīth, so Gharīb we touched upon it a tiny bit last time when we talked about the 'Azīz and the Mash-hūr narration, so we mentioned that a 'Azīz narration is when in at least

one of the levels of the chain of narration, there's 2 people so the lowest they'll go is 2, but it has dropped to 2 people at some point of the chain of narration and we said that the Mash-hūr it drops to 3 or it gets up to 3 or more narrators in 1 level of the chain, but it doesn't reach Mutawātir, which we will talk about later, so the Gharīb is that at one point it's narrated by only one person, so this can mean that one companion only narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so then we would say that it's Gharīb, or it's considered strange, so we'd say that it's considered strange because only 1 person narrated it or it can be that a number of companions narrated it but only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from these companions, so what it means is that if we have the chain of narration form the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), at some point it drops to 1 person, so we have 1 person only narrating it from 1 person, so we consider this to be a Gharīb narration, and then an example of this is the Hadīth I mentioned last week or last lesson, from 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb (رضي الله عنه) that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

إنما الأعمال بالنيات

Or that **"Indeed actions are only based upon their intentions"**

So this Hadīth is only considered a Gharīb Hadīth, and the reason for this is that 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه), he's the only companion who narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so here we have at this level, we have only 1 narrator narrating it from him, then from 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه), the only narrator who narrated it from him was 'Alqamah(رحمه الله), so now we have 2 levels of the chain only have 1 narrator narrating it from each of the people, then from 'Alqamah(رحمه الله), only Muhammâd ibn Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله) narrated it from him, so we only have 1 person in each of these levels of the chain, and then from him, from Muhammâd ibn Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله), Yahyâ ibn Sa'īd al-Ansārī(رحمه الله) narrated from him, so we have the first 'Omar (رضي الله عنه) then 'Alqamah(رحمه الله), then Muhammâd ibn Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله), then Yahyâ(رحمه الله) so we have 4 levels of this chain, only 1 person narrated it from the other person, and then after that, many people narrated it from there, so in this chain we see that not only 1 level had only 1 narrator, but 4 levels only had 1 narrator in it, and then from there, it went on.

Student: Do you mean that it's only reported from 1 Sahābī, like if there was 1 more Sahābī who reported the exact same Hadīth, ti wouldn't fall under that category, is that what you mean, like from the beginning, that's what we're talking about right?

Shaykh: From the beginning, right, but it can also fall that way later way, so say for e.g. that 2 companions narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from them, so he happened to narrate it from both of them.

Student: So we're basically looking for repetition, if you see it more times, the more chances are it's true that we take it.

Shaykh: It can be, so the further down the chain you get, the more important it is, because if one Sahābī narrates it, really we don't care, we have no doubt in it, if only 1 Tābi'ī narrates it, if they're considered a trustworthy narrator, we still accept it, but the importance grows the further we go down the chain, so for e.g. say 5 generations down the chain, we only have 1 person narrating it from one Shaykh, how did this not spread in this fashion, that's kind of typical of Ahādīth spreading.

Student: So it's not the beginning, we're talking towards the end, the issue would come?

Shaykh: It can be in the beginning but it's a lot less important. In the Sahābah, it's irrelevant really. This is just an example of how it can end up, it can be in the Sahābah, it can be in the Tābi'īn, it can be later on, so the further down the chain we find it, the stranger we think that it is, because typically one companion if they narrate it, say they have 10 students, so now we have 10 narrating it from them, each of them they have say 15, well now we have 150, like so, and if all of a sudden if you check and somewhere down the line and only 1 person narrates something, well what happened here, that's kind of the way we look at it.

So yeah, this is with regards to the Gharīb narrations, so in general in and of itself, we don't always consider it to be a defect, but like i said it can be a defect, so for example if 1 companion narrates something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), we don't consider this to be a defect at all because

we know that there will be certain situations that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) might be with a companion, the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) would tell him something, so the fact that only 1 person narrated it from him, it doesn't seem strange to us, i mean there's no problem with it, then likewise with the Tābi'īn because the Sahābah would have their students but not all of them had students that they would teach in circles or that they would pass on Ahādīth in a formal manner, so that we would say that if one of them, if only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from a Tābi'ī that it would be a problem, but if we look, we know that the Sahābah would pass on the Ahādīth, the Tābi'īn in that generation and beyond, what they used to do is, they used to have circles of knowledge where they would pass on the Ahādīth that they would learn, so they would sit and they would have their students and they would say I heard from so and so from so and so that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) did this or the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, so the further down the chain we get, the more and more students these scholars would generally have, so this is why it's considered to be a defect, especially the further down the chain we go, because like I said we should find generally this pattern that it starts small and then it grows and then it grows further and further and further, so if we find this irregularity that it later on in the chain that it's only following 1 chain and the regular pattern isn't being followed, then we could declare that it's likely a mistake or something happened within this chain that led to this problem. So this is what a Gharīb narration is and by knowing this especially if we look at the Hadīth of 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه), and many Ahādīth as well, we see that there's a claim that people often say that we don't accept Āhād narrations or singular narrations when it comes to issues of 'Aqīdah.

So they'll say for e.g. if we have a Hadīth about the Jannâh or the Nār or the Yawm al-Qiyāmah or something that happens in the grave or something about the signs of the day of judgement or something like this, often they'll reject them and they'll say that this hasn't come in a Mutawātir narration, so they'll say for e.g. this hasn't been mentioned in the Qur'ān and it hasn't come in a Hadīth that is extremely widespread so we don't accept it. This is a misunderstanding because if we see that not all singular narrations, so not all Gharīb Hadīth are considered weak, we have to look at each one individually and then judge, does the fact that only 1 person narrated it from their Shaykh, does it affect it or not, because we know that 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه)

was the only 1 who narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), this doesn't affect the authenticity of this Hadīth, 'Alqamah(رحمه الله) was the only one who narrated it from 'Omar(رضي الله عنه), that didn't affect it, and so on and so on down the chain, so just rejecting things based upon that is a mistake but also not taking it into account is also a mistake, so we have to say that it can be a defect depending on the situation of each narration. So this is an explanation of what a Gharīb Hadīth is.

Next the author says:

<div align="center">

وكلُّ مَا لْم يَتَّصِلْ بِحَالِ ** إِسْنَادُهُ (مُنْقَطِعُ) الأوْصَالِ

</div>

Which translates as **"and each report that does fall short in its full connection, its chain is really lacking, severed in its union"**

So here he defines Munqati' as severed or we can translated it as disconnected or broken or anything like that, so if we know the chains of narration, like we talked about it from a person from a person from a person, if there's a break in the chain, that this person didn't hear from the person they narrated it from, then we consider this to be called Munqati', or that it's severed or that it's considered a broken or disconnected chain.

So the factor or the defect itself is considered Inqitā', which means there's a break and Munqati' is the label that we give to the chain, and we come to know this by knowing a lot of things about the narrator, so we need to know when they were born, when they died, where they were born, where they travelled too, where they died, and these types of things, so if we have a narrator who was born in the year 100 Hijrî and he's narrating from someone who died in the year 98 Hijrî, obviously there's something wrong here, because this person died 2 years before the person who's narrating form him was even born, so how can he hear from this person when he wasn't even born yet, likewise maybe he was born but he was like 4 years old at the time, or maybe he was born, but if we look at the dates, he didn't travel to that country where the other person was in, until after he died so maybe they actually did live in the same time but if we look at when and where they travelled it doesn't match up that this person could've actually met this other person, so this is

how we come to know whether there's Inqitā' or if there's a break in the chain between some narrators.

Student: Have any of those Hadīth ever been labelled not weak?

Shaykh: They might've been, but it would've been done either incorrectly in the sense that maybe the scholar who labelled it that way didn't catch that, so maybe they looked at it, they lived in the same time, he died for e.g. when the other one was 20 years old so he could've narrated it from him.

Student: But it has happened though?

Shaykh: Yes it has happened, that's why it's important to know these things, like just saying they lived in the same time, it leaves a lot of problems in there, because sure they lived in the same time but they never met, or maybe they met but they met when this person was 1 years old, so it's as if they didn't meet, so certain things have to be taken into account as well.

Student: Is there resources to really look at every single person that could've narrated it?

Shaykh: Yeah, it's pretty vast, the resources that are out there, like just on the Sahābah, we have biographies of about 10,000 of them, just from the companions so it grows from there, because obviously every generation would've been larger, so Alhamdulilâh it's very detailed.

And an example of this, like in Munqati' is a Hadīth from 'Abda ibn Abī Lubābah(رحمه الله) that he narrated from 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه) that he used to say in the Salāh:

<div dir="rtl">

سبحانك اللهم وبحمدك وتبارك اسمك وتعالى جدك ولا إله غيرك

</div>

So when we say that in the beginning of the Salāh, there's 1 of these narrations is considered weak because this 'Abda didn't actually hear from 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه), but coz I know a lot of us use this du'ā, it is authentic , the du'ā itself but this chain is weak, so it's just an example of how there can be a break in the chain, so this person didn't hear from 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb (رضي الله عنه), but elsewhere we have it that another narrator narrated it from

'Omar(رضي الله عنه) with the same phrasing, so again we authenticate it, but not because of this, but because of the one that actually has the connected chain.

Student: Would that be another one saying the same thing, or just another one saying that du'ā, does the other authentic chain attribute it to the beginning of the Salāh or is it just the same du'ā.

Shaykh: To the beginning of the Salāh, yep.

Student: Sorry, then why would we even mention the one that has a break in the chain if we have another one with the exact same thing that doesn't have it, you know what I mean?

Shaykh: Yes definitely, that's why it's important to always mention what's authentic first, but i think it would come up often if for example someone narrates it and says the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) did this, this is the evidence, so someone would look at it and say, no this can't be the evidence because he didn't hear it from him.

Student: So it's just a matter of using the right evidence because they're both there, right?

Shaykh: Right, so sometimes it will be actually on the topic, no evidence because all we have is weak things, other times it would be no say for e.g. we have 50 evidences on a topic, some of them are authentic and some of them are weak, because if we only used one and the weak one, someone might come and say hey, this is wrong, and then we're stuck now, right. So that's why it's always important to use what's most authentic at the time because it kind of closes any doors to rejecting it.

So here if we look at what the author mentioned, so if we look at what al-Bayqūnī(رحمه الله) mentioned, it seems that any break in the chain would be considered Munqati', but if we look at what he mentions throughout his poem, he describes different types of breaks in the chains, so for e.g. just before this we mentioned Mursal, and a Mursal is that the Tābi'ī narrates from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so obviously we know there's a break in the chain there, so either we say that Munqati' is general and it has all these different types of possible ways, so for e.g. Munqati' would just mean that there's a break a chain, but then to check where the break in the chain is might have a

different name so we can divide it differently. The point of this is to say that when you find terminology there's always the possibility that certain scholars might use terminology a little bit different, so because it's not directly from the Qur'ān or the Sunnâh, it's by scholars of Islām coming up with terminology as a means to simplify the matters that they're discussing, there's always a possibility that they might use it differently or define it differently, so it just means that we should keep this in mind.

So just to give some more examples, we'll stick with the Hadīth of **Innâmal A'mālu Bi-Niyyāt** because we discussed it already. We have mursal, we discussed it already, so if we have this chain of narration that I'll mention now, you tell me who needs to be missing in order for this to be a mursal narration, so Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) narrated the Hadīth **Innâmal A'mālu Bi-Niyyāt**, he narrated it from al-Humaydī(رحمه الله) from Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah(رحمه الله) from Yahyâ ibn Sa'īd al-Ansārī(رحمه الله), from Muhammâd ibn Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله) from 'Alqamah ibn Waqqās(رحمه الله) from 'Omar(رضي الله عنه), so if we have this chain of narration, who would need to be missing in this chain in order for it to be considered a mursal narration?

So we have, 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) narrated it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), 'Alqamah ibn Waqqās(رحمه الله) narrated it from him, Muhammâd ibn Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله) narrated it from him, so in order for it to be mursal, 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه) needs to be omitted. So a Tābi'ī narrates it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then this would be considered a mursal narration.

How about in order for it to be considered Munqati', so the author described Munqati' that there's a break in the chain, but we already have a definition for when the Tābi'ī narrates it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), we have a label for that that it's mursal, so we know that Munqati' wouldn't apply to this, so who would need to be missing in the chain in order for us to call it a Munqati' Hadīth?

So anyone between al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) and 'Alqamah ibn Waqqās(رحمه الله), anyone missing there, we would consider it to be a Munqati' Hadīth. Also for those who were present before, we didn't get into it into detail, but do you know what a Mu'dhal narration is, or we called it problematic.

We discussed it 2 classes ago I think, so mu'dhal is that there's 2 or more people missing in a row, so who would need to be missing from this in order for it to be considered a mu'dhal narration? [Student] Pretty much any 2 after each other. [Shaykh] Right, so after al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) if 2 people were missing in a row in any point, then generally we would consider it to be mu'dhal, and then there's other types of breaks in the chain that we would consider to be defects, but we'll get into that once we get into those definitions.

So this is what the Munqati' Hadīth is, what the definition of it is, and obviously we can see what the problem with that is, why it's a defect because obviously if someone came to you now and said so and so said this, and you said who did you hear that from. And he mentions somebody who you know for a fact never met this person who he's saying he heard it from, the first thing is going to be, well how do you know he even said where'd he get it from, right? So that's how we will deal in our daily lives, obviously this is infinitely more important when we're discussing Sharī'ah matters and attributing something to the Sharī'ah, so a lot of this is just even logic, like if there's someone missing in the chain or if someone didn't meet someone, then obviously how can we accept it or attribute it to the Sharī'ah.

Student: The only way you would know if it's Munqati' is if you know their biography, right. If you know the person's life, that's it and not anybody can tell you it's Munqati'.

Shaykh: Right, so the more problematic the defect is, then the harder it is to find.

Student: Munqati' is pretty Ya'nī you gotta know your stuff.

Shaykh: Yeah, sometimes it might be even kind of hidden, they might've actually lived in the same time but maybe they just didn't meet. That's a lot harder to figure out than someone who maybe they never ever lived in the same time, so anyone, all you have to do is look at their birthdays and say this can't be right, so it shows the importance of the sciences of Hadīth and so much comes down to really knowing your information and it's not just something that anyone can pick up and say hey I know this kind of thing, you have to do your studying, you have to really know what you're talking about.

And then what we'll talk about last today is the mu'dhal Hadīth, so the author says:

<div dir="rtl">

(والمُعْضَلُ) السَّاقِطُ مِنْهُ اثْنَانِ ** ومَا أتى (مُدَلَّساً) نَوعَانِ

</div>

So the **"mu'dhal Hadīth is when there's 2 or more narrators missing in the chain in a row"**

So if they're not missing in a row, then generally the scholars still call it Munqati', but you might find different ways of stating it, so they might say that, some add the condition that it has to be in the middle of the chain, so they say if 2 people are missing at the end of the chain, it's still considered Mursal, if 2 people are missing in the beginning of the chain, it's considered Mu'allâq, but they have to be in the middle of the chain in order for it to be considered mu'dhal, some don't add this condition, really in the end, it really just comes down to if you find someone saying a Hadīth is mu'dhal, it's good to know how they use the terminology, it just makes things clearer and an example of this, of a mu'dhal narration is Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) narrated a Hadīth in which he said:

It is reached me that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

<div dir="rtl">

للمملوك طعامه وكسوته

</div>

Or that **"for the slave or someone who is owned as a slave, it's required to provide for him with his food and his clothing"**,

So here we have Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) who we know obviously wasn't a Sahābī and wasn't from the Tābi'īn narrating something from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) form his statement, here we have, obviously there's a break in the chain here, so for us to say it's mu'dhal then we have to know that there's atleast 2 people missing in the chain here, so if we look, we can find this narration of this same Hadīth elsewhere in which 2 narrators are missing between Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) and the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), the first is Muhammad ibn 'Ajlān from his father who is 'Aljān, the freed slave of Fatima from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) so here we actually have 3 people missing in the chain, or 2 people missing actually because Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) said that Abū

Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) attributed it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so here this is just an example of where in a specific example we see that there was 2 people missing in the chain, so we know obviously that this in and of itself wouldn't be considered an authentic Ḥadīth, we would have to look elsewhere for this type of thing.

So Inshā'Allâh we'll stop there, next the author talks about Mudallîs or Mudallâs, we talked a bit about last time which is a type of cheating that a narrator would do where they might narrate something from someone that they didn't hear from but they'll use a phrase that doesn't indicate that they did or didn't hear from them so it's like a cheating or it's like an unclear way of kind of giving an impression of hearing something without actually lying, so we'll talk about that starting Inshā'Allâh Tuesday, so we'll stop there Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 6:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

Last thing we talked about was the mu'dhal Ḥadīth which is that there's 2 or more people missing in the chain in a row. The next thing the author says:

ومَا أتى (مُدَلَّساً) نَوعَانِ ** الأَوَّل الإِسْقاطُ للشَّيْخِ وأنْ ** يَنْقُلَ مَّمنْ فَوْقَهُ بعَنْ وأنْ ** والثَّانِ لا يُسْقِطُهُ لكنْ يَصِفْ ** أَوْصافَهُ بما بهِ لا يَنْعَرِفْ

So the next thing that the author is talking about is the Mudallîs or the Mudallâs Ḥadīth, so he says:

"And that which comes concealed..."

So he translates Mudallîs as concealed, I've been translating it as cheating or something like that, he says:

"And that which comes concealed, its types are 2 in version, the first of this is by dropping the teacher and relating from above him using terms like from and that, the second does arise not by dropping but when you describe those traits of his by which he's not recognised"

So here he's going into the issue of Tadlīs which I alluded to a little bit earlier when we were talking about the **m'an 'an** Hadīth or when a person narrates a Hadīth saying "**from**" because it's a type of phrasing that doesn't necessarily indicate that the person has heard from their Shaykh or even met them, it could be or it could be not that they didn't actually hear so it's a phrasing that is unclear, so we'll talk about al-Tadlīs now, so al-Tadlīs, it comes from the word "**al-dalas**" and "**al-dalas**" is when there is a mixing between light and dark, so it's not pure light and it's not pure dark, so they call it this because it's as if when the person is a Mudallîs and they narrate a Hadīth in that way, they're narrating it in a way, it's not clear, it's not clear that they didn't hear it and it's not clear that they did hear it, so they're giving an indication that it could be this or this, so there's a mixing of truth and falsehood.

So Tadlīs is something that's frowned upon, Imām Shu'bah ibn al-Hajjāj(رحمه الله) who was one of the early Imāms of Hadīth, he used to say that **Tadlīs is the brother of lying** because even though they're not clearing lying in the end the point of it is the same, it's to give some sort of indication or alluding to the fact that they might've heard this when in reality they haven't, so they aren't openly lying but the end result is the same. And he used to say things like:

"If I was to fall from the sky, it's more beloved to me than to perform to Tadlīs" or

"If I was perform zina it would be more beloved to me than to perform Tadlīs"

So he took it very seriously and in his time and after him, the scholars of Hadīth began to really investigate the issue of Tadlīs and trying to find out who was performing it and who wasn't because it was a big issue in the sense that you

have someone who possibly could have heard from someone, but he isn't saying that he did or didn't so it's in that grey area that really needs a high level of investigation, so that's why they began to give it such a level of attention due to the harms that would come from it.

So the author describes Tadlīs as being 2 types, so Tadlīs in general we say that it's a type of weak narration and the reason for this is as we said it's not possible to verify whether this person heard from him or not, so this is the reason why it's an actual defect, so the two types that the author mentions or he mentions 2 types.

So 1 of them as he says, that he removes or he drops his teacher or his Shaykh, and then he narrates it from the person after him by using the word **'An** or "**an**" so for e.g. instead of saying "**I heard from my Shaykh that he heard from his Shaykh**" and then so on, he would remove his Shaykh from the chain and then say "**from so and so**" and then so he'll go straight to his shaykh's Shaykh, so he skipped someone now and this was generally done if that person was considered weak, so they didn't want to be attributed or have something come from them in a weak chain, so they would attribute it to a person above their Shaykh due to the benefit in the sense that weak narrator is dropped from the chain now, but they wouldn't clearly say that I heard it from that person because that would be an outright lie, they would say "**from so and so from so and so**" so technically it is from him so there's no lie in that, but you heard it from someone who you've intentionally dropped from the chain, and obviously for a reason, other times maybe they perform it that way not necessarily because the person that they're narrating from is weak but they might do it because they might want to have a shorter chain of narration or they might want to directly narrate from someone where in reality they didn't narrate from but because we won't always be able to tell who is in between them in the chain, in any case it would be considered a defect, so there's different types of Tadlīs, this is the first one the author described.

So the second type of Tadlīs is that they narrate from someone, and they actually describe them, but they describe them in a way that they're not necessarily known by, so they would instead of saying for e.g. if there's a narrator who's known as Muhammad ibn Ismā'īl or something like that, they would narrate it by his Kunyä, so technically that's his Kunyä, he's Abū so and

so, but nobody knows him as that, so it looks like a different narrator when in reality it's the same narrator, so he's attributing it to the right person, but he's naming him in a way that people wouldn't actually know.

Student: His name was Muhammâd ibn Ismā'īn, they would narrate him as?

Shaykh: By his Kunyä like Abū Muhammâd or something or Muhammâd al-Hanafī, so technically it's referring to the same person but nobody knows him by that name, or if he had a nickname, they referred him as his nickname where technically that is his nickname but if you ask anybody who's this guy, nobody's gonna know who he is.

So these are the two main types that the author mentioned, and I'll go into them in a little bit more detail right away, but first I'll just mention that the author only mentioned 2 types of Tadlīs, in reality there's about 10 types, some I'll go into and some of them I won't, and I'll go into each one now, so whether you want to write them or not.

One type is called **Tadlīs al-Isnād**, so this type of Tadlīs is when a narrator narrates something from someone who he met but he didn't actually hear from, but he gives phrasing that would indicate that maybe he heard from him, so we know that it's possible that a scholar would meet another scholar but never actually hear something from them or never narrate a Hadīth from him, so this is a dangerous type in the sense that if you look at their birthdays and if you look at who they met and everything, you'll find that everything lines up but in reality maybe they didn't actually hear this Hadīth from them, so this is one type, and you can see why it's considered Tadlīs because obviously they're giving the impression that they did hear from him, but obviously they didn't hear this specific Hadīth maybe from him, so this is one type.

The second type is called **Tadlīs al-Shuyūkh**, and this is as I mentioned that their Shaykh that they're narrating from is mentioned but they're mentioned in a way that doesn't clearly indicate who that person is, and just to give a concrete example of this or an actual example, there's a narrator named 'Atiyyáh ibn Sa'd al-'Awfī and he was known for this type of Tadlīs, so an example of how he would do this, he would narrate from the Sahābī Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī(رضي الله عنه) who was obviously we know he's a companion, he would also narrate from another narrator who's name was Muhammad ibn Sā'ib al-

Kalbī who was fro the Tābi'īn, so he was a level lower than the Sahābah and this narrator was known as being a liar, and this ibn al-Sā'ib or Muhammad ibn al-Sā'ib, his Kunyä was Abū Hishām, so everyone knew him as Abū Hishām, and this Hishām or his son Hishām was also a liar just like his father but he also had another son who's name was Sa'id, so sometimes when he would narrate something from this Abū Hishām, he would sometimes just say "**From Abū Sa'īd**" so we see here that if he's known as narrating from Abū Sa'īd(رضي الله عنه) the companion, and he also narrates from this other Tābi'ī who's Abū Hishām, instead of saying "**I heard from Abū Hishām**", he would say "**I heard from Abū Sa'īd**", who's everyone gonna think Abū Sa'īd is when he first says that? Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī(رضي الله عنه), although this other person could be Abū Sa'īd(رضي الله عنه) as well because he had a son called Abū Sa'īd but everyone's gonna look at well he narrates from Abū Sa'īd and he also narrates from Abū Hishām, people aren't going to originally think by default the liar is Abū Sa'īd, not Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī(رضي الله عنه) so this is a type of Tadlīs, and we can see again why it's dangerous because you're tricking people into an authentic narration, the whole point of it is to get rid of liars and weak people out of the chain, so you're doing this with this intention, so it's a very dangerous thing and a very important thing to know, but at the same time it's very difficult to know without having a lot of study into the issues of the narrations and the issues of the Asānīd and the men of the chains.

A third type is called **Tadlīs al-Taswiyäh**, so this is Tadlīs, or you can call it equalising or levelling, so this is when the narrator hears a Hadīth from his Shaykh who's a trustworthy Shaykh and his Shaykh hears it from a weak narrator and then that weak narrator heard it from a trustworthy narrator, so he removes that person out of it, so he's not necessarily performing Tadlīs in what he heard, he's removing a person higher up in the chain, so for e.g. he'll say "**My Shaykh told me from...**" and then he'll say from 2 shaykhs above him, which is a way to remove that weak narrator out of the chain, so he's removing somebody 2 levels up or 3 levels up out of the chain instead of removing someone directly that was his Shaykh.

A forth type is called **Tadlīs al-Buldān** or Tadlīs of the areas or the cities or the countries, whatever you want to call it, so this is when someone might say "**I heard from so and so in or behind or past the river**", so generally they might

have a specific idea of what river that he's talking about, but he actually means a different river maybe in his city, so it makes it look like he actually travelled far away and heard from other narrators, in reality he's talking about maybe his own city, he heard from someone in his own river he's talking about, instead of meaning the nile or the tigris river, so those ones, so generally they use a phrasing that indicates something about where they heard it when in reality they didn't hear it that way, so it's similar to Tadlīs al-Shuyūkh where they're using something in a way that people aren't going to expect.

Another type, it's quite rare but I'll just mention it anyway, it's called **Tadlīs al-Qata'** or Tadlīs of pausing, so what this would be is for e.g. if a narrator would say, they want to make it look like they heard something from someone, so if they say so and so told, or if they say "**I heard from so and so**" then obviously they'll be lying because they didn't actually hear it from him, so what some of them would do is say "**I heard...**" then they would pause, then they would say "**from so and so from so and so from so and so**" so they're giving that impression that they heard from so and so from so and so, but what they're saying is that they're just saying "**I heard..**" then they're ignoring it, then they're saying from so and so and then they're attributing it to someone who they didn't hear it from, and this is very rare, but this is a type which was known from some narrators.

And then there's a number of other types, which I won't go into now because it will take to long, but there is **Tadlīs al-Sīgh**, **Tadlīs al-Mutāba'ah**, **Tadlīs al-Mutūn**, **Tadlīs al-Irsāl**, **Tadlīs al-'Atf** and some other types. But the point behind all of it is that a narrator is intentionally using a specific phrasing to give the impression that they've heard something that they didn't actually hear, or they heard from someone that they didn't actually hear, or they heard in a place that they didn't actually hear, and so on, so generally, it's to cover up a defect that's in the chain and they don't want it to be known. So this is Tadlīs, so we'll move on from there.

The next thing that the author says:

<div dir="rtl">

ومَا يَخالِفُ ثِقَةٌ فيهِ المَلا ** فـ(الشَّاذُّ) و(المَقْلوبُ) قِسْمَانِ تَلا

</div>

So next he's taking about the Shāth narration, so he says:

"The one by which the trusted contradicts the greater number, anomalous it is while the switched are 2 in number"

So next he's talking about the Shāth narration, and he translates Shāth as anomalous, so he's saying Shāth which is anomalous is when a trusted person, so a trustworthy narrator contradicts trustworthy narrators who are more than him in number or who are considered more accurate in their narration.

So for example someone who's trustworthy says that he heard from his Shaykh this specific Hadīth, then you have another student of the same Shaykh saying he heard this same Hadīth but he narrates it in a different way, and he's considered more accurate, so in this situation we would look to the one who's considered more accurate because if 2 of them are narrating something from the same person, but they contradict each other, then obviously we need some way of reconciling or figuring out which of the 2 we're going to take, so one thing we would look too is the accurateness of the narrator so if it's known that the one narrator makes mistakes for example say 4 out of every 10, while the other one makes mistakes 1 out of every 10, we're going to go with the one who makes mistakes 1 out of every ten.

Another way of seeing which we would accept would be based on numbers so for e.g. if 5 narrators narrate a Hadīth 1 way and 1 narrator narrates the Hadīth a different way, unless the 1 narrator is considered much more accurate by far than those other 5, than we're going to go with the higher number because it's less likely that 5 narrators would come together on a specific way of narrating a Hadīth and be incorrect while the one person would have the correct way of relating the Hadīth.

So this is what the definition of Shāth is and again, in the sciences of Hadīth, this is an issue that very often gets overlooked, and the reason for this is if you look at the chain, it's connected, the people are trustworthy, so the defect in the Hadīth isn't based upon the person being a liar or the person being untrustworthy or not being accurate or not meeting his Shaykh or something like that, it's something outside of the chain in and of itself, so if you just looked at the chain it would be an authentic chain, so people who only look at the outwardness of the chain, they would say yeah that's an authentic Hadīth we're going to accept it, but really if you delve deeper into the issue or into the

matter, you start to find that yes it's an authentic chain, but there's a more authentic chain that says the Hadīth differently, so in this case we would have to look at that as being a defect as well.

So just some examples of this, al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) has a small book or a small collection of Hadīth related to raising the hands in the Salāh, so he collected the Ahādīth about raising the hands in Salāh, he narrates from 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) that he used to raise his hands in all of the Takbīr's during Salāt al-Janāzah, so Takbīr al-Ihrām, and then after the Fātihah and after the Ibrāhīmiyyâh and then just before the Takbīr, so he would raise his hands with each Takbīr, this is from 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه). This is the authentic narration, there's some less authentic narrations that have it that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) himself would do it, so we see here that some narrators mentioned it that it was from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), those who are more accurate mentioned that it's from 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar (رضي الله عنه), so we see here that the defect isn't in the weakness of the chain, the defect is in the fact that better narrators said that it's from 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) and I guess not as strong as strong narrators attributed it to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so in this case, the scholars of Hadīth judge that it's actually from the action of 'Abdullâh ibn 'Omar(رضي الله عنه) as opposed to the action of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Likewise some other examples of a Shāth Hadīth, for e.g. the narrations about waving the finger during Tashahhûd, so we know that it's authentic to point the finger and the chain itself of waving the finger is authentic, the chain itself, but it's the same Hadīth essentially because one says that he would point it and then wave it, and then the other one just says he would just point it, so I guess the strong scholars of Hadīth have judged that the waving phrase is something that's considered Shāth and the pointing is considered the correct narration of the Hadīth.

Likewise pointing the finger between the 2 prostrations, so there's a Hadīth that mentions that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) would perform Sujūd and then sit up and then it describes his sitting during or between the 2 Sujūd that how he would put his feet and how his legs would be in his arms, one of them mentions that he would point his finger, the stronger narration mentions that he would have his hands on his legs. So that's considered also to be a Shāth

narration and then there's some others that we would talk about before, the recitation of Sūrat al-Kahf on Jum'ah, the correct narration is that it's any day of the week, so that benefit or that virtue of reciting Sūrat al-Kahf applies to any day of the week, it's not specific to Jum'ah and so on, so this is again if you just looked at the outward appearance of the Hadīth of the sanad, it would be considered an authentic Hadīth, so it shows the importance of looking further than that when judging whether a Hadīth is considered acceptable or not. So this is the Shāth.

And then now he's mentioning the Maqlūb, so he says:

و(الَمَقْلوبُ) قِسْمَانِ تَلا ** إبْدَالُ راوٍ ما بِرَاوٍ قِسْمُ ** وقَلْبُ إسْنَادٍ لمتنٍ قِسْمُ

So he's talking about what's called Maqlūb, so he translates it here as switched, so we're talking now about the Maqlūb Hadīth or the switched Hadīth, so he says:

"While the switched are 2 in number, the first a switch within the chain, 1 person for another, but the flipping of the chain to another text, that is the other"

So here he's talking about the Maqlūb Hadīth, so he says one type of Maqlūb or one type of switching is that men in the chain of narration are switched for someone else, so meaning there's a mix up or a switch of the narrators in the chain, and the second type is that the chain of 1 text is switched to another.

So for e.g. you have a Hadīth from so and so from so and so from so and so that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, and then you have a second one where the narrator says from so and so from so and so up to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), someone narrates the 1 Hadīth with the opposite chain and then the other Hadīth with the opposite chain, so they somehow mix up the wrong chain to the wrong Hadīth, so he's saying these are the two types of Maqlūb Hadīth. In reality, there's 2 types of "**Qalb**", so 2 types of switching, one is related to the chain, and one is related to the matn or the text of the Hadīth, both of these if we look at them, they're both related to the chain now,

because he switched one man for another, and one is that the whole chain was switched to another Hadīth, so this is an example of switching 1 man for another.

There's a narrator named Ka'b ibn Murrâ and there's also a narrator named Murrâ ibn Ka'b, if the narrator narrated the Hadīth and said Ka'b ibn Murrâ when in reality it's supposed to be Murrâ ibn Ka'b, he switched the names and we can see obviously why they're very similar names, and that would be considered in and of itself it would be considered a defect, unless we have other chains to show what the correct narration would be.

Likewise a narrator named Sa'd ibn Sinān and Sinān ibn Sa'd, you know the same thing would obviously happen with that, that their names would be mixed up because one is the name and then the father's name, and one is opposite for the other person, so this is just 1 type of switching when it comes to the chain.

And another type of switching would be when the whole chain is switched to another Hadīth, so they take for e.g. the chain related to this Hadīth and they put it to the other Hadīth and opposite. Sometimes that would be done for a number of reasons, sometimes it was done just to test the narrators so they might mention a number of Ahādīth and say what the chain of narration and they're mention a bunch and they would say fix this now, you know put the right chain to the right sanad, and that type of thing, just to see how accurate and how knowledgeable the scholar of Hadīth was. This is something that's permissible to do, but it has to be that the intention is to test the person and then you need to make sure that it's clarified within the same sitting or same meeting which is the correct thing so it doesn't end up getting mixed up. Another reason as to why people would do this is to fabricated a Hadīth, so they might say take an authentic narration from Sahīh al-Bukhårī and whatever collection it is, and just make up a Hadīth and then say this is the sanad for it, so this would be considered obviously a type of fabrication and a type of lie on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) so that obviously wouldn't be allowed and would clearly be a defect because this isn't even a real Hadīth and the chain doesn't belong to that Hadīth, so obviously it's considered a defect.

Student: How would you decide for that, if they put an authentic chain to a fake Hadīth?

Shaykh: First of all they'll have to look at, does this text of the Hadīth openly contradict something in Islām, so if it openly contradicts clearly something in the Qur'ān or something in an authentic Hadīth, obviously we know there's something wrong here, that would be the first indication of it. Another way would be say we have, so they're attributing to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he said something and this person heard it and this person heard it all the way down the chain, generally it's rare that it would only keep 1 chain the whole way, because each Shaykh would have a number of students and then it would go on and on. If you only find it this way, what happened to every other person in every level of the chain how it never got passed on anywhere except in this direct chain, so that would be another indication. Another would be who collected the Hadīth, who's actually saying that this is the chain to the Hadīth? Just some guy, he's not even a scholar of Hadīth, he's just some whatever, we'll say how come none of the scholars of Hadīth collected this Hadīth with this chain, like where did you come up with it, so there's a number of ways, and there's other ways, sometimes the liar would come out and say I made this Hadīth up, so generally it would be first of all to find an indication that this doesn't make sense and then to go from there, to try investigate kind of how it could've come this way.

Student: But that seems like the most common one that when you said where the person who collected it wasn't mentioned in the Hadīth, it was just some random guy.

Shaykh: Right, so for e.g. like the chain that this person's using, it's Imām al Bukhārī's chain, how come he didn't narrate, this is a chain that he always narrates with, from his Shaykh from his Shaykh from his Shaykh, somehow he didn't narrate it, no one who narrates with that chain narrated it, but you ended up with this, obviously that's a defect.

Question: Is it true, is it authentic that 10 guys came to Bukhārī(رحمه الله) with the Hadīths to test him, and mixed up the wording of the Hadīth with the chain, and he correct them and even memorised the weak chains they mixed up?

Shaykh: Some people say that, but at the same time some scholars of Hadīth have said that it's unlikely that that took place just because there's no authentic chain or source of that story, and they didn't used to generally do that type of thing very often, but I mean if you look in his books, the things in his books shows greater knowledge than that would anyway, the knowledge he would have of defects of Ahādīth and knowledge of the men of Hadīth, it's greater than that story would show anyway.

Student: Also have you read when the narrator, I think it was Bukhārī(رحمه الله), they said it was narrated that he travelled to the mountains, and the man trips on his horse, and then he just turned his back and...?

Shaykh: There's some stuff like that, yeah.

So this is just kind of an example of how this switching would take place in the chain, another type of switching would be in the text of the Hadīth, so meaning something was mixed up in the actual text of the Hadīth that tells us that this specific phrasing of a Hadīth is wrong. So for e.g. Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) narrated the Hadīth most people know that there's:

<p dir="rtl" align="center">سبعة يظلهم الله في ظله يوم لا ظل إلا ظله</p>

That there's 7 which Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) will place in his shade on the day in which there's no shade except for his shade. One of them is:

<p dir="rtl" align="center">ورجل تصدق بصدقة فأخفاها حتى لا تعلم شماله ما تنفق يمينه</p>

Or that one of the 7 is **a man who gives Sadaqah or gives charity and he hides it to the point where his left land doesn't know what his right hand is doing.**

There's another narration Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) narrated the same Hadīth, but it says:

<p dir="rtl" align="center">حتى لا تعلم يمينه ما تنفق شماله</p>

Or **that he hides it to the point where his right hand doesn't know what his left hand was giving as Sadaqah**, so they say obviously there was a switch

because we have 2 narrations of the same Hadīth, one mentions that the right hand is giving the sadaqah and one mentions that the left hand is giving the sadaqah, we know that good things in Islām are generally to be done with the right hand, and we know specifically that there's Hadīth about giving and taking to be done with the right hand, so they've said here that this was a switch in the text of the Hadīth that indicates that that specific narration is a weak narration, so the correct narration is that, so that **his left hand doesn't know what his right hand is giving in charity**, and that like I said is narrated by Muslim(رحمه الله) from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه). And another example of that is when Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) in the Hadīth of Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) that he said:

<div dir="rtl">

فإذا أمرتكم بشيء فأتوه ما استطعتم وإذا نهيتكم عن شيء فاجتنبوه

</div>

Or that he said:

<div dir="rtl">

فإذا نهيتكم عن شيء فاجتنبوه وإذا أمرتكم بأمر فأتوا منه ما استطعتم

</div>

Or that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

"If I forbid you from something, then abstain from it and if I command you with something, then do from it whatever you can"

So here we know that it's easier to not do something, you can completely stop doing something and generally that has a lot less to do with ability as opposed to doing something, so there's things that we might be asked to perform that we don't have the ability to perform, but when it comes to forbiddances or things that are forbidden or Harām, it's much less likely that we won't be able to fulfil that due of ability, because it's asking us to stop doing something, so this Hadīth from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) was narrated by al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) with this phrasing, there's one narrated by al-Tabarānī(رحمه الله) from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) as well with the opposite phrasing, so that:

"If I command you to do something, then do it, and if I forbid you from something then stay away from it as much as you are able"

So there's a switch in that, you know obviously the ability was placed as a condition for forbiddances and not for the commands, so here they judge that because there's a more correct narration that has the phrasing opposite plus if we look at the rules of the Sharī'ah generally things that are haram are to be stopped outright, things that are obligatory or recommended are to be performed with the best of ability, so the ability is much more tied to performances as opposed to abandoning things or leaving things, so this is the end of the discussion about Maqlūb Hadīth.

Next, he'll talk about the Fard, which Inshā'Allâh I'll stop there for today and then we'll go into the Fard Inshā'Allâh on Sunday, Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 7:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

Last time we finished talking about, i think it was the **Ibdāl** or the **Badal** or the **Qalb** or the **Maqlūb**, so either there's a switch in the chain of narration or a switch in the text of the Hadīth, so the next thing the author says:

وَ(الفَرَدُ) ما قَيَّدْتَهُ بِثِقَةٍ ** أوْ جْمعٍ أوْ قَصِر على روايةِ

or he says **"and The singular is the tradition or the Hadīth in-fined by a trustworthy person to a region by a way of one narration"**

So this is kind of similar to what we talked about before when we talked about the Gharīb Hadīth, so meaning that either it's only come in 1 complete chain from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or more specifically from a companion or that there's been numerous chains but from one specific narrator there's only 1 narrator from that one, so meaning that at some point there's the issue of only 1 person narrating it from the person above them, and this can be as we

said before with the Gharīb, it can be anywhere in the chain, but generally they discuss it when it's from the Tābi'ī and downward, and it can be 2 types.

It can be that there's only 1 actual chain from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so they call it al-Fard al-Mutlaq, and we talked about it before, there's al-Gharīb al-Mutlaq or the absolute singularity or absolute Gharīb, or absolute Fard, so meaning that overall we actually only have 1 chain of narration or it could be al-Fard al-Nisbī or al-Gharīb al-Nisbī, we talked about it last time, so meaning that someone can say there are numerous chains from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but the only person who narrated it for e.g. from Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) was this person, or the only person who narrated it from Shu'bah(رحمه الله) was this person, or something like that, so in general, there's 2 types, either from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) or from a narrator downward in the chain, and as we talked about before, sometimes this can be considered a defect, doesn't always have to be a defect, but it's something that can be a defect or at the very least it would draw our attention to look into it more and discuss whether it could be a defect, and like we talked about before, that's based upon knowing how a Hadīth is narrated, so we know that it's passed on from generation to generation and generally each Shaykh would have his students, so generally we should see this spreading out of a Hadīth, and each generation would be passing it on a little bit more than another generation, so if we find the fact that all of a sudden one person narrates a Hadīth that no one else narrated, or they narrate a Hadīth that others have narrated, but they narrate it in a specific way that no one else has, then this is a cause for concern, sometimes it would be a defect, and sometimes it won't, but in general it's something that would draw our attention.

And often some books of Hadīth relate these Ahādīth a lot, so either that they're set up or they're written to begin with this intention or sometimes it's just that a person will narrate them or a scholar will narrate the Hadīth and then specify that it's only been narrated by a certain person from a certain person, and this is very common by Imām al-Tabarānī(رحمه الله) in al-Mu'jam al-Awsat so often he'll say, he'll narrate a Hadīth and then say, and no one narrated this from so and so except for so and so, or we don't find this Hadīth except narrated by so and so and he'll mention a specific narrator because just

to draw the attention of the reader so that they know that either this is a defect or it's something they should look into.

Student: So there's Gharīb Mutlaq....?

Shaykh: And Fard Mutlaq, generally they're interchangeable, some might use them in different ways, but overall we say that they're interchangeable, those 2 terminologies, so al-Gharīb al-Mutlaq or Fard Mutlaq is when there's only actual 1 chain from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) right to begin with, so they would say it's only come from this Sahābī to this Tābi'ī, and then to this Tābi'ī to this person from Atbā' al-Tābi'īn all the way down to the person who collected the Hadīth. So we would need to look into that and figure out whether this is cause for concern or not, and the reason for that is certain narrators we would say that even if he narrates something on his own and no one narrates something like him, that we would accept it from him just due to his accuracy in narration...

Student: I'm kind of confused, what do you mean with one chain, like there would be more than one person in the chain?

Shaykh: Each person only had one person narrate it from him, so instead of one Sahābī and then...For e.g. 2 Tābi'īn narrated it from him, and then 2 from them, so if you only find 1 person all the way down or all of a sudden at some level there's only 1 person, how did that happen.

Student: Is that Fard Mutlaq?

Shaykh: If it's from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) all the way down, then it would be Fard Mutlaq, but if it's somewhere later on in the chain where all of a sudden someone narrated it from someone else in a way that no one else did, then we would consider that Fard Nisbī, because it's not related from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it's relating to someone later on down the chain.

Quesiton: So Fard Mutlaq is one person at each level of the chain?

Shaykh: No, from the beginning of the chain the individuality starts or the singular nature of the Hadīth starts that way. And then Fard Nisbī would be later on, it might have started as being numerous people, but then later on

down the chain, it doesn't keep the multitude of people as it goes down the chain.

Student: It's not like I heard from this guy from that guy from that guy from that guy from the Rasūl(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it would just be one guy saying "I heard it from the Rasūl(صلى الله عليه وسلم)?"

Shaykh: No, if it was that way, that would be Fard Mutlaq, if it was another example for e.g. that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said something, 3 of the Sahābah narrated it from him and then 2 Tābi'ī from each of those, but then from the person from the Tābi'ī, only 1 person narrated it from 1 of them, that's called Fard Nisbī. So like I said, sometimes it can be considered a defect and sometimes it wouldn't, but at the very least it would cause us to look into it as to why all of a sudden, this one person is narrating something that no one else is narrating and the reason for that is because like we said before, that they would pass a Hadīth on in a certain way, so they would sit with their students and pass something on, and each of those later on would pass on their Ahādīth to their students and like this, so if all of a sudden, if a Shaykh has 15 students that are very well known that they would narrate whatever they could from their teacher, and then all of a sudden 1 of those students narrates something that none of the other 15 narrated, then it would cause us to question, why didn't the other 14 catch this thing from this person, was there some reason for it, did he narrate it very early on before other students joined him, did he used to travel with him as opposed to the other students, or is it just possibly a mistake that he made and none of these students made.

Student: Which one would be the, I guess look into more, would it be the Fard Nisbī?

Shaykh: Yeah, the further down the chain, that individuality or that that singular narration takes place, the more of a problem, because there should be more students by that point. It's less of a concern at the higher of a chain, because if one Sahābī narrates something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it doesn't concern us at all, if one Tābi'ī narrates something from the Sahābī, we would say that it's a less of an issue, like we would say what's the reason for this. If it's one of the Sahābah that used to be known for narrating Ahādīth and only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from that person, then that's a problem. If it's

someone who wasn't well known for narrating Hadīth, it's a less of an issue for e.g. the Hadīth in which the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) spent 1 whole night in Qiyām reciting this Āyah, so he would recite it and then recite it over and recite it over, so it was 1 verse that he would recite, the Hadīth is from Abū Dhar(رضي الله عنه), only 1 Tābi'ī narrated it from him and i forgot her name off the top of my head, but it was a woman of the Tābi'īn, so the scholars have said that this person narrating something from Abū Dhar(رضي الله عنه) is a cause for concern, it's a weakness because all the other people who would narrate from him, they would be more likely to narrate the Hadīth than this woman who didn't narrate as much as him, so for her to have narrated something from Abū Dhar(رضي الله عنه) that no one else did, then this is a cause of concern.

Student: Just curious out of that 1 Hadīth that you mentioned, is there any other narrations of it or is that the only one?

Shaykh: That's the only one.

Student: Is it weak though, that Hadīth?

Shaykh: Yeah.

So another example is Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) narrated from Hārūn ibn 'Abdillâh(رحمه الله) from Abū Dāwūd al-Hafs from Humayd(رحمه الله) from 'Abdullâh ibn Shaqīq(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), the Hadīth that she said:

"I saw the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) praying while he was cross-legged",

So this is one of the opinions when it comes to someone sick and they need to sit down while praying, how should they sit down, so one of the opinions is that they should sit down like we're sitting now, cross-legged and it's based upon this Hadīth that was narrated by al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله), but after narrating the Hadīth Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) said:

"I don't know anyone who narrated this Hadīth except for Abū Dāwūd"

Who was, so 2 people up the chain from Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) and he said:

"I don't think anything except for the fact that this was a mistake from him",

So because the person who he narrated it from who was Hafs, if it was a correct Hadīth, there should've been a lot more people narrating it from Hafs, so the fact that Abū Dāwūd was the only one narrating it from him was enough for Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) to say that this was a mistake in the way he narrated it because something this important which would tell us how the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) prayed when he was sick and how he would pray sitting down would've been passed on a lot more, so the fact that only 1 person narrated this from Hafs who was Abū Dāwūd, even though the fact that he's a trustworthy narrator, because at this point there shouldn't be only 1 person narrating this Hadīth, so Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) mentioned that this was a mistake from him, and also Imām ibn al-Mundhir(رحمه الله) mentioned the same thing, he said that the Hadīth of Hafs ibn Ghayāth that it was a mistake that was narrated from him, so when Abū Dāwūd narrated this Hadīth from Hafs ibn Ghayāth, it was a mistake because other people narrated it from the person above him, and they didn't mention anything about the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) sitting cross-legged while praying.

So I know it's complicated especially when we're just keeping it in our head, it would be better if we had a board or something to write it down and have a visual reminder and that type of thing, but the fact that down the chain, if we look, and all of a sudden, there's 1 narrator, everyone's narrating the Hadīth from this person in a certain way, and then it continues down after that person in that same way, except for the one chain that falls into this by that one person, so meaning everyone up to Hafs ibn Ghayāth narrated it in a certain way, after him everyone narrated it that same way, except for Abū Dāwūd al-Hafs, so if we were looking down this way, like say you were looking at a flowchart type of thing, all of a sudden when it comes to him, it changed and mentioned that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) prayed while cross-legged, or in addition it was changed, depending on the type, so you look at it as a flow chart, like if you're looking at a hierarchy, all of a sudden it falls a certain way, a certain way, all the way here, and then every side here continues narrating it the same way as everyone else, but then this one person had a mistake this way, is it possible that it's correct? It's possible, is it likely? No, not when we look at everything and this is even though the fact that the person's trustworthy, we're not saying that this person's a weak narrator, it's just compared to what everybody else did, this has to be a mistake.

Student: So is that when you get authentic where something is weak and something is authentic?

Shaykh: Within it you mean?

Student: Yeah.

Shaykh: Yeah, that's how it would happen.

Student: You know how you would say sometimes this first part of it is authentic and the second part is weak, is that how it happens?

Shaykh: A lot of times it's from that yeah, sometimes it's because the narrators are actually weak.

Student: I used to wonder sometimes, how is half of it authentic, and how is half of it weak.

Shaykh: Right, so when you just hear that without knowing how it takes place, it doesn't make sense.

Student: Yeah, but I couldn't figure it out, but this is one of the ways.

Shaykh: One of the ways, yeah. At other times it might be that one of the narrators who narrated it this way is weak, but generally it's comparing it to all the other narrations of the same Hadīth, just like we would do in real life, like say someone came and told you something, everybody is telling you it one way, and all of a sudden one guy out of everybody tells you the same way but he added something into it, he's not a liar, I'm not calling him a liar, but I'm just saying that this is evidence that he made a mistake in this issue.

Student: Sorry, what's that called, is there a term for that?

Shaykh: The individual narration is called Fard, but when it's a mistake like that, they call it Shāth, so meaning that one person contradicted everybody else who narrated it.

Student: So would it be called Sahīh Shāth?

Shaykh: We would consider it weak, technically the chain is authentic, technically because there's none of the defects are in the chain, it's something we found that was mistake of a narrator in the way he narrated it, so

technically if we just looked at the chain outwardly, everything would make sense, they're all trustworthy narrators, everybody met each other, that type of thing, but because we compared it to everything else, we found that something in the text of the chain was wrong.

Student: Wouldn't it make that whole thing weak?

Shaykh: It would make that phrasing weak, but it wouldn't make everything else weak.

Student: What would it be called though?

Shaykh: We would call it Shāth.

Student: The whole narration would be Shāth?

Shaykh: The mistake in part, so the other part would be Sahīh

So this is the discussion on the Fard, next he says:

<div dir="rtl">

ومَا بِعِلَّةٍ غُمُوضٍ أوْ خَفَا ** (مُعَلَّلٌ) عِنْدَهُمْ قَدْ عُرِفَا

</div>

Which he translates as **"Whatever contains a flaw, subtle or obscure, this is deemed defective with them known for sure"**

So here he's talking about the defective Hadīth, and it's called the **Ma'lūl Hadīth**, so Ma'lūl is defective, so here when we talked about the conditions of a Hadīth being authentic, we said that the narrators of the narrators are trustworthy, it's a connected chain, and that there's no Shuthūth which is like the contradicting of those who are more trustworthy and there's no 'ila, so there's no hidden defect in the chain or in the text of the Hadīth, so if we were to look at it, we would see that it would be free from all of these things, so here when we say the Ma'lūl, generally it's referring to a hidden defect, so meaning if we looked at the chain outwardly, it would look authentic, but at further study, we find that there's a mistake somewhere and then we would go with that.

So an example of this is the Hadīth of 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) that she said:

"The messenger of Allâh(صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to sleep while he was upon Janābah without touching any water"

Or that 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) said:

<div dir="rtl">

كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ينام وهو جنب ولا يمس ماء

</div>

And this Hadīth is narrated by Abū Dāwūd al-Tiyālisī(رحمه الله) and Ahmad (رحمه الله), and Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) and al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله) and ibn Mājah(رحمه الله), and the path that they narrate from is Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله) from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها). And this is considered to be a defective Hadīth and what they say is that Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله) made a mistake in how he narrated the Hadīth, so generally this is an authentic Hadīth if we look to how others narrated it, but in this form of the Hadīth, it was actually a mistake, and the reason for this is as we see, Abū Ishāq(رحمه الله) narrated it from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), so many people narrated this Hadīth from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) in a different form, different than the way Abī Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله) narrated this Hadīth.

Student: Who's Aswad?

Shaykh: Al-Aswad(رحمه الله) is one of the Tābi'īn...

Student: Does it say his last name or not?

Shaykh: No, and off the top of my head, I don't know it.

So he narrated it from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) and then people narrated it from him in a certain way, but Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله) is the only one who narrated it in this form, if we look, Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) narrated the same Hadīth from Ibrāhīm(رحمه الله) from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), so it's the same general chain that it goes from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but in that one, 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) said:

<div dir="rtl">

كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا كان جنباً أراد أن يأكل أو ينام توضأ وضوءه للصلاة

</div>

So Imām Muslim(رحمه الله) narrated the same Hadīth from al-Aswad(رحمه الله) from ʿĀʾisha(رضي الله عنها) from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), but it was that:

"If the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was upon Janābah and he wanted to sleep or eat, he would perform Wudū",

So here if we just looked at it, we would say these are 2 different Ahādīth because one's saying that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) would sleep without touching any water, so meaning he wouldn't Ghusl or he wouldn't even make Wudū', and this other Hadīth is saying is that when he was upon Janābah and wanted to sleep or wanted to eat, he would perform Wudū', so if we just look at it, we would say that this is a different Hadīth, but if we see that it's both regarding sleeping and Janābah and performing Wudū' or touching water, and it's both from ʿĀʾisha(رضي الله عنها) and from ʿĀʾisha(رضي الله عنها) they're both from al-Aswad(رحمه الله), you can see in reality, it's the same Hadīth, but Abū Ishāq al-Sabīʿī(رحمه الله) made a mistake and when he narrated it, he narrated it in a different way.

And this was mentioned by many of the scholars of Hadīth that they said that this is actually the correct way in which the Hadīth was narrated, so here if we just looked at the chain itself, we would say that it's an authentic chain but we need to look further than that, just looking at the chain itself isn't enough, and because when we look further into it we see that there's other mistakes or other defects that can come into the chain, and this was mentioned by Ahmäd ibn Hanbal(رحمه الله) and Ahmad ibn Sālih al-Misrī(رحمه الله) and many other scholars of the early generations, but later on other scholars would declare it to be authentic, just by looking at the outward appearance of the chain so obviously this is a mistake, and if the early scholars of Hadīth judge something to be a certain way and they agreed upon that, then we can't end up going against them and making up our own judgement out of that. So this is just a quick explanation of the Maʾlūl Hadīth, and what it means again is just that the outwardness of the chain is authentic, but upon further study we see that there's a defect in the chain, so here you'll start to see that there's some similarity in a number of the definitions that we've talked about.

So for e.g. here we're saying that the Maʾlūl Hadīth is the defective Hadīth, which means the outward appearance of the chain is authentic, but we found

a defect in it. When we talked about the Fard, we actually gave an example of that, in that when the narrator narrated that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) prayed sitting cross-legged, you'll see that a lot of the things are the same in the sense that we're saying that a person makes a mistake and we compare it to other narrations from other scholars of Hadīth and we figure out where this defect is, so the reason for this is that we're saying in the end that the Hadīth can be defective and that this would be that the outward appearance of the chain is authentic, but there's something hidden that needs to be found, so then some of these other definitions like the Fard and the Shuthūth or the Shāth and these types of things are means of figuring this out, so we would say that the Hadīth is Ma'lūl and the reason for the 'ila is that it's a Fard narration, so meaning only 1 person narrated it in a certain way, that's the cause for it being Ma'lūl, so don't get worried or don't be worried if you start to see things that they're very similar in their definitions because sometimes they might be the same thing with different labels, other times it might be, one is the definition, this is the thing that leads to this Hadīth being like this, this is the cause for it, so if you're starting to see things that are mixing in, it doesn't mean you're misunderstanding it, it just means that there's alot of overlap and similarity between definitions and causes.

Student: What is the English translation for Ma'lūl?

Shaykh: Defective.

So this is the definition of defective, next he says:

<div dir="rtl">

وذُو اخْتِلافٍ سنَدٍ أو مَتْنٍ ** (مُضْطربٌ) عِنْدَ أهْلِ الفَنِّ

</div>

Which translates as: **"Those that do contain various in their text or chain, confounded are they named as the masters of this game"**

So here he's talking about the Mudtarib Hadīth and what this is, is that there's a confusion in the way that it's narrated, so for e.g. someone might narrate a Hadīth one way, another person narrates it a different way, another person narrates it a different way to the point where we can't actually figure out anymore what is the correct way, because either they are all at the same level of trustworthiness, so we know that one of these is correct, but because of

them being at the same level, it's not possible to figure out which is the correct one. Other times, it might actually be in the sanad or the chain of narration, so someone narrates the Hadīth with a certain chain, another one narrates it with a similar chain, but there's a little difference in it, and so on and so on, to the point where we can't actually figure out what is the correct chain that belongs to this Hadīth, at this point we would say that this would be considered a defect, because we can't decide which one to take.

Some examples of this, you might find a Hadīth that is narrated as Marfū', so to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), then someone else narrates it as Mawqūf, so to one of the Sahābah, and there might be no evidence for us to use this as to which is the correct narration here, so at this point, we would do our best and if in the end, it was irresolvable, then we would have to declare that it's mudtarib, or it's confounded or it's confused to the point where we can't actually judge that it's an authentic narration.

And an example of this is the Hadīth of Abū Bakr(رضي الله عنه), in which he said O messenger of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) or:

يا رَسُولَ الله قَدْ شِبْتَ قالَ: شَيَّبَتْنِي هُودٌ وأخواتها

Or that Abū Bakr(رضي الله عنه) narrated that he said:

"O messenger of Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), you've begun to look old, so the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) replied, he said: I was made old by hud and its likes"

So meaning Sūrat Hūd and its like, so to this Hadīth, meaning that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) due to the stress or due to the descriptions mentioned in Sūrat Hūd and the likes of this Sūrah, he began to age, or began to have the effects of age come to his appearance.

And this is narrated by al-Dāraqutnī(رحمه الله), but in reality this is a weak Hadīth and the reason for it is because there's Idtirāb or there's confusion in how it was narrated, so for e.g. It's only come from the path of Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله), so the person we talked about before, some of the narrators have it as **Mawsūl**, so meaning that it's a full chain to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), some of them narrated it as mursal, so meaning that the Tābi'ī attributed

to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), some of them have it from Abū Bakr (رضي الله عنه), some of them attribute it to Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī(رضي الله عنه), and some attribute it to 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), and so on, so here we see that it's only come from 1 chain which we said can be a defect, but can also be fine, but within this one chain after one point in the chain, it became changed numerous times, so some of them attributed with a full complete chain, others have it from the Tābi'ī to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), some have it as being from this Sahābī, some have it from a second, some have it from a third, so at this point, it's not possible to judge which is the correct one, and some of them have it with a number of other Sūrahs mentioned by name, and some of them have it only with Sūrat Hūd and the likes, so all of these confounding factors placed together show that there's so much confusion as to how this Hadīth was related correctly that we would have to judge that there's something wrong with this chain for it to have this many problems with it or this many confusing factors related to it.

Student: So then we just throw off the Hadīth?

Shaykh: We would say, yeah. If it was authentic we would know that Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى) preserves this religion and the way it's preserved is by having clear and authentic chains of narration that can be understood by the scholars of Hadīth, so if they look at it and say there's so many problems with this that we can't actually judge it at this point what is the correct one, then obviously that's a defect, because it wouldn't of come to us this unclear and confused if it was something that was authentic.

Student: So what directly to the Rasūl(صلى اله عليه وسلم) from a Tābi'ī and then move down the chain, there was no Sahābī.

Shaykh: In one of the narrations, some of them mention the Sahābī, but they differ on who the Sahābī was.

Student: Okay I see, so even the right ones have problems within them.

Shaykh: Right, and then some say "**Hūd and the likes of it**", others say "**Hud this, this and this...**" so it's narrated in so many different ways by so many different people that it becomes to the point where it's now, it can't be correct.

Student: Mursal is when a Sahābī is missing, right?

Shaykh: When a Tābi'ī narrates it from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Student: Yeah, so no Sahābī in the middle.

Shaykh: With no Sahābī, so again the reason why it's a defect isn't because there's a Sahābī is missing, but it's because we don't know who the Tābi'ī got it from, he could've got it directly from a Sahābī or someone else.

Student: Yeah, coz he didn't meet him, we have to know where he got it from.

Shaykh: Obviously yeah, exactly.

And another example of this is, there's a Hadīth narrated by al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله) from Shurayk ibn Abī Hamza(رحمه الله) from al-Sha'bī(رحمه الله) from Fātimah Bint Qays that she said:

<div dir="rtl" align="center">

سئل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن الزكاة فقال إن في المال حقاً سوى الزكاة

</div>

Or that Fātimah Bint Qays narrated that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was asked about the zakat and he said:

"Indeed there is a right or a duty in your wealth other than the zakat"

And then in another narration of the Hadīth that's narrated by Ibn Mājah(رحمه الله) it says:

"Indeed there is no other duty in your wealth besides your zakat"

So it's the exact opposite, both of them are weak, so it's not the perfect example, but in this sense, if they were equal in their narration, they're actually completely contradictory and it's from the same Sahābī saying that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said this, and another narration saying the exact opposite that would actually contradict each other, because if the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) says in one Hadīth:

"There's no duty on your wealth except for zakat"

And he also says **"There's also a duty in your wealth besides zakat"**.

It's the exact opposite, this would be an example where if it would be impossible to figure out the correct one, we would have to disregard both of them and say that both of them must be mistaken otherwise it wouldn't have come to us.

Student: We can't take either one?

Shaykh: Right, because you know if one of them was correct, then there would be some evidence to show which is the stronger one, if they look exactly equal to us, there's something majorly wrong there.

Student: Is there lots of these?

Shaykh: There is, it's not as common as other defects like breaks in the chain or weak narrators, so it's one of the less common defects when it comes to Hadīth because generally there's some evidence to show us which is the stronger narration.

Student: Do they have a name or no?

Shaykh: Yeah, it's called Mudtarib.

Student: Which one would you call Mudtarib, both(narrations)?

Shaykh: Both yeah because whatever we can't judge if it's correct because of the confusion.

Student: Coz they're contradictory, so Mudtarib I'm guessing means contradictory?

Shaykh: Confounded or confused.

So this is what the mudtarib Hadīth is, next he says:

<div dir="rtl">

وَ(الُمدْرَجاتُ) في الحديثِ ما أَتَتْ ** مِنْ بَعْضِ ألفاظِ الرُّوَاةِ اتَّصَلَتْ

</div>

Or that he says **"And those interjections into the Hadīths, are what have come to us from the words of the narrators, in the chains continuous"**

So here he's talking about what we call Mudraj, so meaning it's interjected, so meaning that there's a Hadīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), later on down the chain, one of the narrators says something that then gets mixed up in the Hadīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so it could be for a number of reasons, so if you're narrating a Hadīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) to the Sahābī to the Tābi'ī and downward, someone says something along that chain, after that person says it, the other narrators become mixed up and begin to think that it actually belongs to the words of the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), and not necessarily that narrator.

And it can be done for a number of reasons, so sometimes it's to clarify a Shar'ī ruling, so meaning that there's a Hadīth and then one of the narrators along the chain is narrating the Hadīth to his students, but he says something to explain something in the Hadīth, not intending to add it into the Hadīth or anything, but the people who hear it, some of them begin to think that this actually belongs to the words of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), sometimes it can be just to clarify a word in the Hadīth, so maybe there's a word that the Sahābī used or even the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) used that isn't a common word, so one of the narrators would explain what this word actually means and after that person, the people begin to think it belongs to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم)'s words, but it actually belongs to that one narrator, and lastly they sometimes might do it as a means of fabrication, so meaning that they might take a Hadīth and add something to it along the way, in this case obviously it would be haram and it would be a fabrication, so there's a number of reasons as why this would happen. And it can be in a number of places, so it can be in the beginning of the Hadīth or it can be in the middle or it can be in the end, so an example of it being in the beginning of the text of the Hadīth is Hadīth when Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), he said that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

<div dir="rtl">

أسبغوا الوضوء ويل للأعقاب من النار

</div>

So this Hadīth was narrated by Abū Qutn(رحمه الله) and Shabābah from Shu'bah ibn al-Hajjāj(رحمه الله) from Muhammâd ibn Ziyād al-Tahān(رحمه الله) from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) this way, so meaning the full thing that Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) said that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

<div dir="rtl">

أسبغوا الوضوء ويل للأعقاب من النار

</div>

Or **"Perform your Wudū' correctly, woe to the heels from being touched by the fire"**,

But then if we look at other narrations from Shu'bah(رحمه الله) so he was the narrator in the chain or one of the narrators in the chain, if we look to the other narrations from him, what it actually is, is that Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) said:

"Asbighū al-Wudū'(or perform your Wudū' correctly) because I heard Abul Qāsim(meaning the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) say:

<div dir="rtl">

ويل للأعقاب من النار

</div>

or **"Woe onto the heels that they be touched from fire"**,

So what this means is that Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) was telling some of his companions or warning them **"Perform your Wudū' correctly"**, so meaning touch all the area that needs to be touched with water because I heard the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) say:

"Woe unto the heels that they be touched from fire" **or** **"Beware that your heels be touched by fire"**

So this Hadīth was that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) saw someone who didn't have all of their foot washed when they were performing Wudū', and so he warned him, meaning you need to perform it correctly, if it's not performed correctly that that area may be touched by the fire, so Abū Hurayrah (رضي الله عنه) saw an opportunity here to teach the people, so he said **"Perform your Wudū' correctly"**, this is why and he narrated something from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم). All of the correct chains have it narrated exactly that way, that there's this full discussion with Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), one of the chains got mixed up and attributed it all to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), that he said:

"Perform your Wudū' correctly..." to the end of the Hadīth,

So at this point we can see that part of this phrase belongs to Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) but it became mixed up in the chain as being attributed to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

Student: What's this called?

Shaykh: Mudraj.

It can also be in the middle, there's the well known Hadīth from ʿĀ'isha (رضي الله عنها) in which she was describing how the revelation began to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), there's a phrase in there that's considered Mudraj, so what it is is when in the Hadīth it's ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها) said:

<div dir="rtl">

وكان يخلو بغار حراء فيتحنث فيه وهو التعبد الليالي ذوات العدد

</div>

Or that ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها) said:

"He used to go into seclusion in the cave of Hirā' where he used to perform Tahannûth, and it is worship"

So **Tahannûth** literally is worship, like **Ta'abbûd** is the more well known word used for ʿIbādah, the well known word used for worship, in this Hadīth ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها) used the word **Tahannûth** or "**Fayatahannâth**", so the narrator in the chain said "**wa huwa al-Ta'abbûd**", so he explained what **Tahannûth** is, and it's worship. Later on in the chain, it got mixed up with the words of ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها), so some would just attribute it right into the words of ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها), but clearly it's an explanation because it wouldn't make sense for her to use one type of word for worship and then say "**and that's worship**", like she's not teaching people words at this point, she's relating a story, so when you see that she says something, and you see an explanation of the word is that she said, and there's other evidences that shows us that it wasn't actually from the words of ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها), it was just one of the narrators who was explaining what ʿĀ'isha(رضي الله عنها) was saying, but others mixed it up with his words.

And another example is that it's at the end of the chain, so an example of this is the narrator from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) who said:

رقيت مع أبي هريرة على ظهر المسجد فتوضأ فقال إني سمعت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول إن أمتي يدعون يوم القيامة غرا محجلين من آثار الوضوء فمن استطاع منكم أن يطيل غرته فليفعل

Or the narration from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

"Indeed my Ummâh(nation) will be called on the day of judgement, while they are Ghurrån Muhajjîlīn..."

So meaning that their faces and limbs will be glowing due to the effects of the Wudū',

"...so whoever is able to extend his Ghurråh..."

So meaning the glowing on his face,

"...then let him do so"

So this is the Hadīth from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) indicating that on the day of resurrection, the Muslimīn will be known by the glowing of the areas in which they used to perform Wudū' on, so whoever can make that glowing area longer, he should do so, so meaning whoever can perform Wudū' further, then it's obligatory, so meaning up your arm or further on your legs or further past your face, then he should do so, so this Hadīth it's narrated by al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) and Muslim(رحمه الله), but there's ten other narrations of this same Hadīth that don't mention anything about going past that area, so meaning the Wudū' or whoever can go further, then he needs too, then he should do so, so if we look at this, the fact that 10 narrators narrated it one way, and only 1 narrated it that way, plus the fact that if we look, the words "**Ghurrån Muhajjîlīn**" they're words that used to be used for when you're describing a horse that had white on its face and white on its limbs, so Ghurrån relates to the face, Muhajjîlīn relates to the limbs, so it's possible for e.g. you can extend the glowing of your limbs, because if you wash your arms to the top of your elbow, technically you can go all the way up to your arm-pit or your shoulder, and

you're still washing your arm, and likewise with your leg, you can go all the way up to your knee and you'd still be washing your leg.

So that's possible, but they say that already when we make Wudū', we wash all of our face, so because every part that we wash is our face, so it's not possible to extend the glowing of your face when you're already washing your whole face, so that's something that's impossible at this point. Sure if we wash further into our hair or into our neck, but at this point, we're not actually falling into what this Hadīth means, because we're not actually washing our face more, we're washing other parts of our hair or neck or ears or whatever, so they say that the fact that ten narrators narrated it one way without that, plus the fact that we know that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم)'s words are Wahī, and that they come from Allâh(سبحانه وتعالى), there would be absolutely no mistake in it, linguistically or anything that has to do with intellect or anything like that, but it's possible from the Sahābah, it's possible that obviously they would make mistakes, so when we see that the phrasing that is in this Hadīth, it's actually something that's impossible, you can't extend the area of your face if you've washed all of your face, that's an impossibility, so all of these things coupled together, they say that this is evidence that it's not from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and that it was actually Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) who was saying this, so meaning he would wash further, so he would wash up his arms and up his legs, but this was his understanding, so this was him telling his companions this is what the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) is now explaining:

"Whoever is able to do this further, he should do so"

So they put those 2 things together plus the fact that the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't used to go beyond his elbows or beyond his ankles, he wouldn't wash up his leg or wash up his arm, all of these things put together indicate that it's not from the prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it was actually from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), so this is the Mudraj, they call it a mudraj narration or the act itself or the verb of it would be Idrāj, so Inshā'Allâh we'll stop there for today and then we'll continue Inshā'Allâh Tuesday Wallâhu a'lam.

Lesson 8:

إن الحمد لله نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره ونعوذ بالله من شرور انفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا من يهده الله فلا مضل له ومن يضلل فلا هادي له وأشهدوا أن لا اله الا الله لا شريك له وأشهدوا أن محمداً عبده ورسوله أما بعد:

So the next thing the author says, he says:

ومَا رَوى كلُّ قَرِينٍ عنْ أخْهْ ** (مُدَبَّجٌ) فَاعْرِفْهُ حَقًّا وانْتَخِهْ

Or translates it as **"And what appear narrates on the authority of his brother, adorned it is, so know it well and by it gain your honour"**

So here he's talking about a Hadīth or a narration called Mudabbîj or Mudabbâj, which he translates it as adorned, so what this means is that the chain of narration contains a narrator or its narrating people in the chain who have narrated from each other, so examples of this, it can be in any level of the chain, so meaning that there's within 1 level of the chain, or 1 Tabaqah they call it, so meaning the Sahābah or Tābi'īn or Atbā' al-Tābi'īn or anything like that, that they're narrating from each other, but they've also narrated from opposite ways elsewhere, so it might not make sense.

So to give an example it would be if in the chain there's a narration from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) that he narrated from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), so here obviously they're both from the level of the Sahābah(رضي الله عنهم), so they're narrating from each other, but also in other Ahādīth, 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) has narrated from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم). And this can be at any level of the chain, so for an example of this is Imām al-Hākim(رحمه الله) narrated a Hadīth from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) that he narrated from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) that she said:

"One night, I lost the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) in our bed so I began searching for him with my hand..." until the end of the Hadīth,

109

So here 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) is narrating a Hadīth in which Abū Hurayrah (رضي الله عنه) is narrating from her and then passing it down, and the Hadīth is that Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه) narrated from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) that she said:

"فقدت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ذات ليلة من الفراش فجعلته اطلبه بيدي..."

So here they're at the same level, and 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) is being narrated from by Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), but at the same time there are other Ahādīth in which 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) narrated from Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه), so for e.g. in another Hadīth Imām al-Hākim(رحمه الله) narrated from 'Alqamah(رحمه الله) from 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) that she said to Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه):

انت حدثت عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عن امراة عذبت في هرة: فقال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول ذلك

Or that 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) said to Abū Hurayrah(رضي الله عنه)

"Is it you who narrated from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) that a woman was punished due to a cat, and then he said I heard the Messenger of Allâh(صلى الله عليه وسلم) stating that"

So the point is here is that if we find a Hadīth in which the chain has 2 narrators at the same level who have both narrated from each other, so sometimes this one has narrated from that one, and sometimes the other one has narrated from the first one, they call this Mudabbâj, so meaning that it's adorned, so meaning that each one has narrated from the other, and it doesn't relate exactly to the authenticity of the Hadīth, but it's something that shows the amount of research or the amount of knowledge that scholars might have regarding narrators of Hadīth, because they'll be able to say that here, these 2 people are at the same level and one has narrated from the other.

But in other Ahādīth it's the opposite, where the person who's being narrated from is actually the one doing the narrating in other Ahādīth, and this can be at

any level as i said, so from the Sahābah an example is Abū Hurayrah (رضي الله عنه) and 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها), sometimes she narrated from him, and sometimes he narrated from her.

At the level of the Tābi'īn, at that level for e.g. Al-Zuhrī(رحمه الله) narrated from Abū al-Zubayr(رحمه الله) in some Ahādīth, and in other Ahādīth Abū al-Zubyar(رحمه الله) narrated from Al-Zuhrī(رحمه الله), and likewise Imām Al-Zuhrī(رحمه الله) narrated from 'Omar ibn 'Abdûl 'Azīz(رحمه الله), and in other Ahādīth 'Omar ibn 'Abdûl 'Azīz(رحمه الله) narrated from Al-Zuhrī(رحمه الله), and at the level below them, so from the Atbā' al-Tābi'īn, Imām Mālik(رحمه الله) narrated from al-Awzā'ī(رحمه الله) in some Ahādīth, and in other Ahādīth Imām al-Awzā'ī(رحمه الله) narrated from Imām Mālik(رحمه الله), and then at the level below them, Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) narrated from Imām 'Alī ibn al-Madīnī(رحمه الله), and 'Alī ibn al-Madīnī(رحمه الله) narrated from Imām Ahmad ibn Hanbal(رحمه الله), so one of the benefits of knowing this is knowing that for e.g. generally you might look at a chain and see well this person narrated from another person, and it's generally within that form, so it's always the one person narrating from the other one, so if you see it opposite way, it doesn't mean that it's a mistake, so it's important to know this, because at first glance if it's always known that so and so was a student of so and so and they narrate something, you're going to expect it in that form, but if you see it in the opposite way, first thing would be well this must be a mistake, the person mixed up because the other person usually narrates from him, but when you see it this way, you can tell that they did actually narrate one from the other sometimes, and then the opposite way other times, so it's important to know although it doesn't exactly relate to the authenticity of the Hadīth, it's important to know because it might protect you from thinking there's a defect in the Hadīth or the chain when in reality it's just they're at the same level and sometimes one would narrate from one and then sometimes it would be the opposite. So that's what the adorned or Mudabbîj, what that means.

There's also another type or something similar to this where it would be not necessarily that they're contemporaries or they're peers but that it's generally what they would call it **"Riwāyat al-Akābir 'an al-Asāghir"** or the narration of the Older from the Younger or the Major from the Minor or the Senior from the Junior, anything that you want to call it like that, so what it would be is that

generally a person would narrate from his Shaykh and that person would narrate from his Shaykh all the way up the chain, but sometimes you'll find that it goes the opposite way, so generally a student will have a Shaykh that he narrates, but sometimes the Shaykh will narrate from his student, so it's important to know that as well because again it would stop you from thinking that there's a defect in the chain, so by knowing the person who's the Shaykh and the person who's the student, generally gives you the idea of knowing who is narrating from who, but by knowing that sometimes a student would be the person who is narrated from by his Shaykh, then again it protects you from thinking that there might be a defect in the chain because sometimes if a student would have other shaykhs, would take a Hadīth from that one, and then one of his other shaykhs will take it from the student because he might not have met the other person who he took the Hadīth from, so this is the point which is a little bit different than what the author mentioned, because what the author is mentioning here is Mudabbîj, which is actually when it's not a Shaykh narrating from his students, it's a peer narrating from his peer, so generally we would go from 1 level up to the next level, but what the author's mentioning here is that it's someone at 1 level taking from someone at the same level and that they've also done it opposite way or vice versa, so this is the Mudabbîj narration.

Next he says:

<div dir="rtl">

مُتَّفِقٌ لَفْظاً وخطاً (مُتَّفِقْ) ** وضِدُّهُ فيما ذَكَرْنَا (الْمُفْتَرِقْ)

</div>

Or **"Agreeing with one another in wording and in script is the congruous, the flip of this as we have mentioned is termed incongruous"**

So here what the author is talking about is a type of narration that's called **al-Muttâfiq wal-Muftariq**, or it's the congruous and the incongruous. So here, what this is, is that the names of the narrators they match in the way they're written and the way that they sound, so for e.g. 2 narrators named Muhammâd ibn 'Abdillâh, at this point their name is written the same and it's actually pronounced the same way as well, their first name and the name of their father, so for e.g. from the Sahābah(رضي الله عنهم) a narrator 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd ibn 'Abd Rabih(رضي الله عنه), and another Sahābī named 'Abdullâh ibn

112

Zayd ibn 'Āsim(رضي الله عنه), so here if they just mention the name of the Sahābī as 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd, you won't know which one is which, but obviously they're 2 different people once you go further up in their lineage because when it gets to the grandfather, they have a different name, and you will be able to differentiate between the two, and the first one 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd ibn 'Abd Rabihi(رضي الله عنه) is the one who was shown the Adhān in his sleep and then who came to the prophet and explained it, while the second one, 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd ibn 'Āsim(رضي الله عنه), he's the narrator who narrates one of the main Ahādīth relating to Wudū' or one of the most descriptive Ahādīth of the Wudū' of the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), so these are 2 different narrators, so the importance of knowing this is because if we don't know the difference between the 2, someone might say, this Tābi'ī narrated Ahādīth from a companion, but he didn't actually meet because you might have for e.g. a Tābi'ī who didn't meet 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd 'Abd Rabihi(رضي الله عنه), so if he narrates a Hadīth and the scholar of Hadīth looks at this, he might say **"Yes, he was a Tābi'ī, yes he was a companion, but he actually never met him"**, because he's assuming that he's talking about the other 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd(رضي الله عنه) because their name is written the same way, and it's pronounced the same way, there's no difference until you get further up in the lineage, so if one assumed that every Sahābī named 'Abdullâh ibn Zayd (رضي الله عنه) was the same person, they will fall into alot of mistakes by assuming, well this Tābi'ī didn't meet this companion so there's a break in the chain here, so knowing this is an important issue when it comes the sciences of Hadīth.

Another example where some of them are further down the chain, for e.g. 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه), we know from the Sahābah and he's obviously the second Khalīfah, there's also another narrator who's at the level of Imam Ahmad who's named 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb, so if someone assumed that everyone named 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb was the companion, then they might look at this and say that 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb narrated from someone above his level from someone from someone from the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم) and would assume that this is a defect in the Hadīth, and would reject the Hadīth or say that there's something wrong with this because they think that everyone named 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb is the exact 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb who's from the Sahābah, and also there's other narrators that are like this as well, for e.g. Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd al-Tayālisī, and Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd al-Hāshimī, and

Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd al-Zahrānī, all of these are at the same level of narration, one died in 204 Hijrī, one died in 219 Hijrī and one died in 234 Hijrī, so these narrators all had the same first name and name of their father, so if someone didn't know that there's different people named Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd who are at the same level but were different people then they're obviously going to look and say "**Well this person died in this year, that's going to affect the narration**" when it's actually someone else, or this person only narrated from these shaykhs, when in reality he's thinking about a different Sulaymān Ibn Dāwūd, so knowing the names that are similar when they are actually different people is something that is very important as well, and even more so when they're at the same level, when they're at different levels, it's easier, like it's less likely that you're going to mix up 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb(رضي الله عنه) the Sahābī with 'Omar ibn al-Khattāb who was at the level of Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله), because obviously it's extremely unlikely if not impossible that the person at the level of Imām Ahmad(رحمه الله) would even narrate something directly to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and obviously if there was, there would be anywhere between 3 and 6 people between him and the prophet, so it would be a huge defect and it would be unlikely to take place to begin with, so this is what they call al-Muttâfiq wal-Muftariq, and it can be at different levels, so it can be they share the first name, it could be they share the same name and father's name or up to the grandfather or they can even share all of these as well as well as their lineage, so they might all be from the same area and be attributed to the same area or from the same tribe and be attributed to there as well, so knowing this is important, and even there's books written on this specifically, there's a book called "**Al-Muttafiq wal-Muftariq**" by al-Imām al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī(رحمه الله) in which he discusses this and mentions this person with this name, here's when he was born and died, this is who he narrated from and this is who narrated from him, this is another person with the same name, this is when he was born and died, this is who narrated from him, and who he narrated from and so on, in order to make it easier to differentiate between them because like I said the closer they are in their level or in the time that they lived, the more confusing it would be and the more important it would be to know these things. Then the author continues, he says:

(مُؤْتَلِفٌ) مُتَّفِقُ الخطِّ فَقَطْ ** وضِدُّهُ (مُخْتَلِفٌ) فَاخْشَ الغَلَطْ

Or he says **"The common one agree's only in its script, opposed to it is discordant, so be weary of a slip"**

So here he's talking about something that's similar to what we just talked about, the Muttâfiq and the Muftariq, except that this is called **al-Mu'talif wal-Mukhtalif**, or it's called the common and the opposed I guess we translate it as according to this translation of the poem, so what this is, is that it's written the same way, but it's a different person and it's actually pronounced differently, so if you just looked at the actual script of their names, it's the same thing, it's the same letters, it would be different levels of how close it is and how it's written, but if you just look at the script or how their name is written down, it looks exactly the same but it's pronounced different.

So for e.g. 'Abīdah and 'Ubaydah, they're obviously 2 different names, but they're written exactly the same, **'Ayn, Bā', Yā', Dāl, Ta Marbūta**, they're both 'Abīdah and 'Ubaydah, they're written if you just look at it and you didn't have the Harakāt on it, it would be the exact same name, but obviously it's not only a different person, it's even pronounced differently.

Also 'Amārah and 'Imārah, it's written the same way, **'Ayn, Mīm, Alif, Rā', Ta Marbūta**, they're both written the same, but they have the Harakāt on them are different.

And Muhammâd ibn Salām, and Muhammâd ibn Sallām, Salām and Sallām, they're both written the exact same way, except on the **Lām** there's a **Shaddâh** for one of them,and the other one doesn't have the Shaddâh, so obviously not only is it 2 differently people, it's even pronounced differently.

And Bashīr and Bushayr, and these are another example in which the Harakāt are written differently.

Student: How can they tell who they were back in the day, because there was no Tanwīn, right?

Shaykh: The Harakāt were added later, yeah I guess they would know it by...[Student interrupts]

Student: But how did they know that it's exactly the same name.

Shaykh: They would have to look at who they narrated from, who narrated from them, when they died, where they're from, because if you just looked at it, especially if it doesn't mention their father's name, if it's just a name like 'Abīdah or 'Ubaydah, if it just says one of the two, unless you know fro e.g. 'Abīdah only narrated from this person, 'Ubaydah didn't, obviously it's not going to be 'Ubaydah, it's going to be 'Abīdah, so knowing those things is important as well. But also even more of a complicated one, as we know originally the Arabic script didn't actually have the dots on the letters even, the Harakāt were added later, but even the dots were added later, so for e.g. **Tā'** has 2 dots on it, it didn't have anything before, it was just the line down and the lines sideways, so it would be the same as a **baa'** and it would be the same as a **Thā'** and it would be the same as a **Yā'**, so all of these, it's the same shape, the dots were actually added later, so this would actually even complicated things further, so for e.g. Burayd and Yazīd, they're written the exact same way if you take away the dots, it's a line which would be like a **Bā'** or a **Yā'**, then there's a curved line down with would either be the **Rā'** or the **Zayn** and continuing that way as well, as well as Bashār and Yasār, they're written the exact same way, if you've taken away the Harakāt and the dots that were added, then they're written he exact same way as well, so even further back there was more of a possibility of things being mixed up, so it was even more important at that time because there was two actual possible ways that these would get mixed up, based upon the Harakāt and based upon the I'jām, or the dots that were added to differentiate the letters, and books were written about this as well, so whole books were written by scholars of Hadīth just to help differentiate between the narrators who's names were written similarly but pronounced differently, so for e.g. "**Al-mu'talif wal-mukhtalif**" by al-Dāraqutnī(رحمه الله) which is a 5 volume book, and **Mushtabah al-Asmā'** and as well as **Mushtabah al-Nisbah** are 2 other books about this as well written by 'Abdûl Ghanīb and Sa'īd al-Azdī who was from the students of Imām al-Dāraqutnī(رحمه الله) as well, so it shows the importance that scholars not only did they say you should know this, but they would actually write books about it to help differentiate it to the point where this one by Imām al-Dāraqutnī(رحمه الله) was 5 volumes in length, it shows the importance of it, it also shows how common it would be as well, because if it is not something very common, you're not going to have a 5 volume book on the topic as well, so this shows

the importance of knowing the men in the narrations as well as how their names are pronounced, and in these books there would be an explanation as to how you would differentiate between the two. So if their name is written the same, how would you know which one is which, and they would go through and talk about Ahādīth in which there was a dispute and how you would decide as to who was the correct narrator and who wasn't, so this is **al-mu'talif wal-mukhtalif**, next the author says:

(وَالْمُنْكَرُ) الفَردُ بِهِ رَاوٍ غَدَا ** تَعْدِيلُهُ لا يْحمِلُ التَّفَرُّدَا

Or he translates it as **"Detested is the tradition transmitted by a single person, whose vindication cannot strengthen the sole narration"**

So here he's talking about the Munkar Hadīth. And the Munkar Hadīth, there are many definitions of what a Munkar Hadīth is, but there are two main definitions that are widely used or widespread in their usage.

The first is that a Munkar narration is when a weak narrator contradicts a trustworthy or an accepted narrator, so it's similar to what we talked about before when we said Shāth, so Shāth we defined earlier as being an acceptable or a trustworthy narrator contradicting someone who is more trustworthy or more accurate or more acceptable, so here according to the first definition of Munkar, it's similar to the Shāth except that the narrator who's contradicting is actually a weak narrator, so this is the first definition, and that was the definition that was mentioned by Imam ibn Hajr al-'Asqalānī(رحمه الله), and it's generally today the more widespread or the more known definition of what a munkar Hadīth is.

The second definition and it's the definition that the author seemed to mention or seemed to adhere too, is that it's when a narrator narrates something individually with a singular narration but he's not at the level of where we would say someone like this we would accept his singular narration, so for e.g. if someone was known as being a very accurate narrator and he was from the top students or one of the top students of his Shaykh, if he narrated something that no one else narrated form his Shaykh, we would likely accept it, because we would say, well this is person is well known for their accuracy and how they narrate and they are the top student of this student, so the fact

117

that he narrates something that no one else did from his Shaykh isn't something that is far fetched, it would make sense if this person lived his life with his Shaykh, it's not far off that he would narrate something that none of the other students did, as opposed to an acceptable narrating something from a Shaykh that he was only with for a month while no one else from his students who were even with him for years and years narrated. So here we're not saying that it's weak because the narrator is a weak narrator, we're saying because he's not at the level that we would accept something that he says by himself, he needs to have some support in what he's saying, so this is the second definition, it's very very close to the Shāth definition and infact this is the definition that was more widely used according to the earlier scholars of Hadīth, so al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) and Muslim(رحمه الله) and al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله) and the Earlier scholars of Hadīth would more likely or more often use it this way. And infact the phrase Shāth wasn't actually around in their time, this is originally they would say Munkar is anytime a narrator contradicts narrators who are stronger than them, regardless of he was a weak narrator or not, and some scholars actually used the word munkar for any Hadīth in which we have evidence that it was a mistake. So even if he's not contradicting other narrators and even if he's an acceptable narrator, he's not a weak narrator, if we have evidence for whatever reason that this Hadīth that he narrated is a mistake, then some scholars would call this type of Hadīth a Munkar Hadīth.

And an example of this is Imām Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) narrated from Hammām(رحمه الله) from ibn Jurayj(رحمه الله) from al-Zuhrī(رحمه الله) from Anas(رضي الله عنه) that he said:

<p dir="rtl" style="color:red; font-weight:bold">كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم اذا دخل الخلاء وضع خاتمه</p>

Or that **"The Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) if he would enter the washroom or toilet area, he would take off his ring"**

And we talked about this Hadīth in detail in the Fiqh lessons, but this Hadīth imam Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) after narrating it, he mentioned that this is a munkar Hadīth, as the only person who narrated it was Hammām, and Hammām narrating from ibn jurayj, he's not at the level of someone who should be someone who narrates something by himself from ibn jurayj (رحمه

(الله), so if you look at the number of students that ibn Jurayj(رحمه الله) had and their level of companionship with ibn jurayj(رحمه الله) compared to Hammām(رحمه الله), he's not at the level of someone who should've had something that no one else had from this scholar ibn jurayj(رحمه الله) from the Atbā' al-Tābi'īn, so like we talked about before, if a person has 50 students, some of them were with them day in and day out, and all of a sudden only 1 student narrates something that none of these other students narrated, obviously there's probably something wrong with this, even if the person is a trustworthy narrator, because we would say well, yes he's a trustworthy narrator but the fact that none of the other students narrated this despite the fact that they were very keen on narrating everything from their Shaykh that they could find, that there's something wrong with this narration. And this is an example of when the scholars would use the word Munkar even though the narrator was trustworthy, so this is just an example of the Munkar narration.

Next the author says:

$$\text{(مَتُروكُهُ) مَا وَاحِدٌ بِهِ انفَرَدْ ** وأَجمعُوا لضَعفِه فَهُوَ كَرَدّ}$$

Or he says **"The tradition is disregarded that a single one related, whose weakness is agreed which is then rejected"**

So here he's talking about the Matrūk Hadīth, and the Matrūk, very often you would hear Shaykh Hārith in his lessons on Sīrah, he'll often say this has come from a narration of so and so and he is Matrūk al-Hadīth, so very often you would've heard it more from him than in our Fiqh lessons and our 'Aqīdah lessons, but what a Matrūk Hadīth is, is that it's narrated by someone who's weakness is agreed upon, so meaning there's a person in the chain who everyone agree's this is a weak narrator, no one ever said he's acceptable, no one's accepted his narrations, everyone who's talked about this narrator has said that he is a weak narrator, so the reason for this is he's Matrūk so meaning we abandon his narrations, there's no reason to narrate what he mentions because everyone has agreed that this is a weak narrator, there's no possibility of him being an acceptable narrator as opposed too if there's a narrator if we say he's weak, but for e.g. Some scholars said he's an acceptable narrator, at this point we would say he's not as weak as someone else, because

some scholars considered him to be at the level of someone who's Aḥādīth would be accepted. So this is when we would say this Hadīth is Matrūk or it contains someone who's Aḥādīth are Matrūk or abandoned or here he translates it as discarded. Some scholars would say that a Matrūk Hadīth is any Hadīth in which the chain of the Hadīth contains someone who is accused of lying, so we don't have proof that this person's a liar, but there's enough accusation around this narrator that he's a liar that his Hadīth would be Matrūk. So as you see here, sometimes the word Matrūk relates to the Hadīth, sometimes it relates to the narrator, so it just depends, if they say this Hadīth is Matrūk, then obviously they're talking about the Hadīth, if they say this narrator is Matrūk, then obviously they're talking about the narrator.

And an example of a Matrūk narrator is 'Omar ibn Hārūn and he narrated a Hadīth that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) used to trim his beard from the length and the width, so this narrator is a Matrūk narrator to begin with, plus the fact that there's no other narration of all the details that was narrated from the prophet about how his beard was and how he would dress and how he would come his hair and all these things that for us to have a Hadīth that the chain contains a Matrūk narrator and is mentioning something that no one ever mentioned ever before and it contradicts other things that were mentioned about the Prophet, then this is an example of a Matrūk narrator, 'Omar ibn Hārūn and this Hadīth is obviously a Matrūk Hadīth, it was narrated by Imām al-Tirmidhī(رحمه الله), and there's a number of books that were written about just collecting the Matrūk narrators, so there's **al-Du'afā' wal-Matrūkīn** by Imām al-Nasā'ī(رحمه الله), so he would mention narrators that are weak or Matrūk, as well as another book with the same name **al-Du'afā' wal-Matrūkīn** by Imām al-Dāraqutnī(رحمه الله), as well as **al-Majrūhīn** by Imām Ibn Hibbān(رحمه الله), so the scholars were very keen on narrating or collecting the names of narrators who were considered Matrūk because it's an important issue, because once you find a chain that contains someone who's that weak, essentially the Hadīth is useless, it's useless in and of itself and it's useless as a strengthening factor, so we wouldn't say well this Hadīth is Matrūk but it's strengthened by another Hadīth. A Hadīth with a weakness to this level would never be strengthened, it's considered an extremely weak Hadīth to the fact that we don't even pay attention to it, so that's the importance of knowing the difference between just the Hadīth that's weak or a Hadīth that's Matrūk or

just knowing who a weak narrator is, you know because he has a bad memory as opposed to a narrator who's actually Matrūk, so this is what the Matrūk Hadīth is.

Student: Is Matrūk the lowest level?

Shaykh: The lowest would be Mawdū', because it's clearly fabricated, we're saying that this is a lie even.

Student: What's the level of Matrūk?

Shaykh: Generally, we can't state for sure that it's a lie, but we know 100% that it's wrong.

Student: But you can't use it at all, right?

Shaykh: You can't use it all.

So I guess in the end, it's the same in its level as a Mawdū' Hadith in the sense that it's useless, but with a Mawdū' we're declaring that this is an actual lie as opposed to this is a clearly wrong Hadīth but we're not able to establish the fact that it's a lie kind of thing, and then next the author says:

<div dir="rtl">

والكذِبُ الْمُخْتَلَقُ المصنُوعُ ** علَى النَّبيِّ فذَلكَ (الموْضُوعُ)

</div>

Or he says **"And the lie, concocted and contrived, On the Prophet, is fabricated and connived"**

So here he's talking about the Mawdū' Hadīth, and the Mawdū' Hadīth is one that's fabricated, so meaning that it's a lie on the Prophet, and some examples of this are the Hadīth or it's not even a Hadith, but the fabricated Hadīth that they say:

<div dir="rtl">

الايمان لا يزيد ولا ينقص

</div>

Or that **"Ēmān does not increase and does not decrease"**

So this Hadīth, it's a lie on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), it contradicts the clear verses in the Qur'ān, like when Allah(سبحانه وتعالى) said:

فأما الذين آمنوا فزادتهم إيمانا

Or **"As for those who believe, then this increased their Ēmān"**, and the many Ahādīth in which the Prophet described actions as being from Ēmān and Ēmān can be at different levels and so on and so on, and it's a consensus from Ahlâl Sunnâh wal-Jamā'ah that Ēmān increases and decreases. So this Hadīth is clearly a lie on the Prophet to the point that Imām al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) said:

"Anyone who narrates this Hadīth is deserving of being beaten and thrown in Jail"

So this shows the importance that first of all, you're lying on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم). Secondly, you're attributing to him, something that actually is contradictory to the Sharī'ah, so for e.g. Someone might narrate a Hadith that's clearly a lie, but it complies with everything in the shari'ah, so they might say that the Prophet said "such and such" about a specific action being a good action. This is not against the Sharī'ah in the sense that it might be encouraging a certain good deed, it's a still a lie and you still can't do it, and it's still against the shari'ah in the sense that it's not from the shari'ah but even worse than that is to make up a Hadīth that contradicts the shari'ah, because now it's a lie plus it's disproven and it's going against the Qur'ān and the Sunnâh which is an example of this.

And another example is a Hadīth Imām al-Tabarānī(رحمه الله) narrated in which they attribute to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) that he said:

لأن يربي أحدكم جرو كلب خير له من أن يربي ابنه في آخر الزمان

Or that they attribute to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسم) that he said:

"If one of you were to raise puppies, it would be better for him than to raise his child in the end of times"

So there's no basis for this Hadīth, it's a complete lie on the prophet, so even just based upon when you hear it, the more you read Ahādīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and the more spend time with the sunnah, the more you can kind of tell something seems off, obviously if it's confirmed from the

Prophet, we accept it whether we understand it or not, or whether it complies with our intellect or not or anything like that, but sometimes even the phrases, when you hear it, there's something off about this, and when it comes to knowing if a Hadīth is Mawdū' or if it's fabricated, there's many ways that the Scholars would come to know this, so the first is that if in the chain there's someone who's known as being a liar or even worse that he's known as being a fabricator of Ahādīth, so not only would he lie, but he would fabricated Ahādīth on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم).

The second is that there's something in the text of the Hadith that indicates to us that it can't be right, that there's no way that this is from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and there's a number of ways that they would be able to tell this about the text of a Hadīth, so the first would be that it openly contradicts something in the Qur'ān and an example of this is a Mawdū' Hadīth in which it supposedly states that the length of time or the time of which the Earth would be around or that human beings would be around or whatever you wanna call it is 7000 years and that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) was sent in the last 1000 years of the Earth, so this obviously we know that this is false for a number of reasons. First of all that Allah(جل وعلا) said:

$$\text{يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ أَيَّانَ مُرْسَاهَا قُلْ إِنَّمَا عِلْمُهَا عِنْدَ رَبِّي لا يُجَلِّيهَا لِوَقْتِهَا إِلا هُوَ}$$

Or that Allah(جل وعلا) said:

"They ask you about the hour…" and then until the end of the verse where Allâh(جل وعلا) said that **"…No one would bring about its time except for Him"** and other verses that **"No one knows when the hour would be except Allāh"** even the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) didn't know and so on, and this is something that's widespread in the Qur'ān and the Sunnâh.

So for here, for the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) to be specifying that he's coming in the last 1000 years of 7000 years, then obviously this is an indication that he would've known the approximate time of when the hour was.

Secondly, the fact that we just know by example or reality, if he was sent in the last 1000 years, and now we're over 1,400 years from the Hijrah itself, so obviously it couldn't have been correct from that point of view as well. So just looking at things and seeing that they're obviously contradicting the Qur'ān that it can't be right, and likewise if it contradicted a clear Hadīth like we mentioned here about the one that al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله) said, that the person who narrates it should be beaten and imprisoned, that the Ahādīth are Mutawātir that indicate that Ēmān increases and decreases, so for a Hadīth to come and clearly state that Ēmān doesn't increase and decrease, then obviously we know that this is a false attribution to the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Another example would be that the narrator mentions that clearly contradicts what we know about history, so for e.g. if a narrator would say 'Ā'isha (رضي الله عنها) narrated to me or told me, so then if he was asked, well what did she look like and he gives a description of her that doesn't match what was known about her, so for e.g. if she was light skinned and he said she was very very extremely dark skinned, obviously we know that there's a problem with that that it couldn't have been right, so even if a woman narrated it, we would say that there's something wrong here, it doesn't even match her description or if it's said where did she tell you that, and she says in the city of Wāsit, so then we could then look at this point, we say well 'Ā'isha(رضي الله عنها) died before the year 60 of Hijrī and at that time, the city wasn't even established or wasn't even made yet, so how could she have told you something in a place that didn't exist yet, this is clearly a lie, so there are certain things that we would look at it and say, based upon what we know about just historical facts, you're mentioning something that clearly goes against this, obviously this person is a liar or they're taking it from a liar or something like that.

Other times, the narrator himself will say that he made up the Hadith, so he'll openly state, Yes I made up this Hadīth for whatever reason, so obviously then, this would be a clear indication that it's a Hadīth that's fabricated. Other times, they might say that it's fabricated Hadīth or he's a fabricator due to certain things he would state that clearly go against reality, so for e.g. an example that they gave of this is of if a person said, he was walking along one day, and he was extremely thirsty and he came upon a house or building that at the top of

the building, it was full of water, so he took something of the ground and threw it against the wall, so the water started gushing out, and he started drinking until he wasn't thirsty anymore, so he threw thing up at the thing, and it plugged a hole, you'd say, you know what, you're a liar, that's not something that happens, I'm not going to accept what you say about the Dunyâ, let alone about the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم). So just things like this, you'll come to know people that they say things that you think, you know what, either this person is an outright liar or there's something wrong mentally with this person or whatever the case may be, but in any case, we're not going to accept what this person narrates from the Prophet.

So these are the ways they'd come to know whether a Hadīth was Mawdū' or fabricated. Another issue with regards to the Mawdū' Hadīth, well what is the reason behind this, someone might say, how can someone openly lie on the Prophet, or what's the benefit of doing so, we know it's a great sin, so why would someone do this, so for e.g. one thing might be people might fabricated a Hadīth in order to support an ideology that they have, so for e.g. the fabricated Hadīth:

<div dir="rtl">

حب الوطن من الإيمان

</div>

Or **"Love of your homeland (or being patriotic) is from Ēmān"**

Obviously, this is a fabricated Hadīth and it goes against the Qur'ān and the Sunnah and the general rules of islam, but someone might fabricated this Hadīth as a way to drop support for their culture or for their nationality or whatever the case may be, because if someone says **"I reject nationalism"**, but then someone says **"Well no, the Prophet said loving your homeland is from Ēmān"**, well then this might trick people or dupe people into thinking that nationalism is something acceptable in islam.

Likewise the Hadīth that some mention or they attribute to the Prophet (صلى الله عليه وسلم), mentioning the virtues or that he said:

<div dir="rtl">

من قاد أعمى أربعين خطوة

</div>

Or **"Whoever guides a blind person for 40 steps, will have such and such of a reward..."**

So that this is a blind person who needed people to help him out, so he made up a Hadīth, "**whoever helps a blind person this much will get this reward**" because then people will starting helping this person and he doesn't have to pay them or he doesn't have to really look into spending time trying to find someone to find him out and so on, so you can see that there would be some Dunyâ benefits of trying to make up a Hadith against the Prophet, and many books were written specifically discussing or mentioning fabricated Ahādīth so that they would be well known and the people could be aware of these Ahādīth or know that they weren't Ahādīth from the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), for e.g. **Al-Mawdū'āt** by ibn al-Jawzī(رحمه الله), also Imām al-Shawkānī(رحمه الله) had a book **"al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah fil Ahādīth al-Mawdū'ah"**, and there's many other books that would discuss Ahādīth that are fabricated, and even some mention from Imam Ahmad that he had one of his sons memorise 15,000 Hadīth and then he said **"All of these Hadīth are Mawdū', so now go onto memorising what is Sahīh"**, so it would show the importance of knowing what is Mawdū' because if you know it's Mawdū', obviously you're not going to be tricked into following it, you're not going to accept it and then think, maybe it's weak but I'll find something that would strengthen it in another Hadith, if you know outright that this is a lie on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), you can be aware of it and you can warn against it. Also it shows how widespread fabricated Hadīth are, so someone might say, well what's the likelihood that someone would lie on the prophet. If we have volumes and volumes and volumes of these that scholars have mentioned are fabricated Ahādīth, obviously this is something that needs to be payed attention too, and we need to be aware of it, because if it was 1 or 2, but if it's scholars who have gathered these and have volumes of these lies on the Prophet, obviously it's something that's widespread.

And then just to mention a last point on the Mawdū', there's an agreement that lying upon the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is a Major Sin, and some scholars have said that outright lying on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) is an act of disbelief, so it's not just a Major sin, but if someone does it, they actually would leave Islam if the evidences made known to them, so it's clarified to

them that this isn't allowed to do, if they continued after that, they would leave islam, and others have differentiated, so they would say that if they fabricate Ahādīth that complies with Islām, so for e.g. Taking something that's a recommended act and fabricating a Hadīth that would support doing it, saying that whoever does this will have this reward, that this would be a major sin, but if they fabricated something that contradicts something, then it would be an act of disbelief, because they would be making something Harām Halāl or making something Halāl Harām or making something Obligatory not Obligatory and so on, so some have differentiated, but the point is to know that at the very least, it's a major sin and that even if the basic lying against the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), many scholars have actually held this to be an act of disbelief even if it doesn't contradict Islām, so this shows the severity of lying on the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم), and that's the end of what the author mentions with regards to types of Ahādīth or discussing the different terminology of Hadīth, so all that's left is just the ending of this poetry that the author mentions, so he says:

وقَدْ أَتَتْ كالْجوْهَرِ المكْنُونِ ** سَمَّيْتُهَا: مَنْظُومَةَ البَيْقُوني

Or he's talking about the poem itself now, and he says:

"And it has come like a pearl, veiled from show, the poem of Bayqūnī I have named it so"

So he's mentioning a virtue of this poetry that he wrote in the sense that he's mentioning the name of it obviously al-Manthūmat al-Bayqūnī, here they translate it as "**The ode of Bayqūnī**", and then he says:

فَوْقَ الثَّلاثِين بأرْبَعٍ أَتَتْ ** أَقْسامُهَا ثمَّ بخيرٍ خُتِمَتْ

Or he says **"By 4 beyond 30, thus they have come, their lines in some with grace they're done"**

So he's summing it up by saying that this is the end of it and it has reached 34 lines of poetry, and so Inshā'Allâh that will be the end of this series with regards to the terminology of Hadith, Wallâhu a'lam.